U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Nevada State Office
340 Financial Blvd
Reno, Nevada 89502

California State Office
2800 Cottage Way, #W1623
Sacramento, California 95825

December 2025

Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning

Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment for Nevada and Northeastern California

DOI-BLM-WO-2300-2022-0001-RMP-EIS

https://www.blm.gov/programs/fish-and-wildlife/sage-grouse

Cover Photo: Steve Ting

Lower Bar Photos (left to right):

US Fish and Wildlife, Rachel Woita, James Yule

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Greater Sage-grouse Rangewide Planning
Nevada/California Record of Decision
and
Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment
for Nevada and Northeastern California

Nevada State Office
340 Financial Blvd.
Reno, NV 89502

California State Office
2800 Cottage Way, # W1623
Sacramento, CA 95825

December 2025

Cooperating Agencies

United States Forest Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Nevada Department of Wildlife
Nevada Department of Agriculture
Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Nevada Division of Minerals
Churchill County
Elko County
Eureka County
Humboldt County
Lincoln County
Mineral County
Nye County
Pershing County
White Pine County

Consulting Tribes

Battle Mountain Band of the Te-Moak Tribe Duckwater Shoshone Tribe
Lovelock Paiute Tribe
Modoc Nation, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Summit Lake Paiute Tribe
Timbisha Shoshone Tribe
Walker River Paiute Tribe
Yerington Paiute Tribe
Yomba Shoshone Tribe

Dear Reader Letter

In reply refer to:
1610 (NV000)
Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning

Dear Reader:

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is pleased to announce the issuance of the Nevada/California Record of Decision (ROD) and Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) Amendment for the Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning in Nevada and Northeastern California. This document includes both the Nevada/California ROD and the Approved RMP Amendment for the planning area. The Nevada/California ROD and Approved RMP Amendment, as well as all associated National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents, are available online on the BLM's National NEPA Register at: https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/2016719/510.

The Proposed RMP Amendment /Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was released on November 15, 2024 and was subject to a 30-day protest period that ended December 16, 2024. Resolution of protests is delegated to the BLM Assistant Director for Resources and Planning on behalf of the BLM Director. The BLM received 60 unique protest letters during the 30-day protest period. The resolutions of the protests are summarized in the BLM Director's Protest Resolution Report: Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning Proposed RMP Amendment and Final Environmental Impact Statement, which is available at: https://www.blm.gov/programs/planning-and-nepa/public-participation/protest-resolution-reports

Thank you for your interest in the Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning RMP Amendment. There are numerous values and interests associated with the management of greater sage-grouse (GRSG) habitat across the West. We remain committed to implementing the policies and conservation measures that will meet the BLM's multiple-use and sustained yield mission, provide for the habitat needs to conserve GRSG, avoid the need to list under the Endangered Species Act, and minimize long-term regulatory burdens. Your continued involvement in the management of public lands in Nevada and Northeastern California is invaluable in ensuring BLM management will sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of BLM-administered lands for present and future generations.

Sincerely,

Jon K. Raby
BLM Nevada State Director

Joseph Stout
BLM California State Director

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Page

DEAR READER LETTER III

RECORD OF DECISION 1

Introduction 1
- California RMPs 1
- Nevada RMPs 1

Decision Area 2
- Nevada Counties: 2
- California Counties: 2

Decision 3

Purpose and Need 3

Alternatives Considered 6
- Alternative 1 (Applicable Decisions from the 2015 Approved RMP Amendment) 6
- Alternative 2 – No Action (Applicable Decisions from the 2019 Approved RMP Amendment) 7
- Alternative 3 7
- Alternative 4 7
- Alternative 5 8
- Alternative 6 8
- Proposed RMP Amendment 8

Rationale for Decision 9
- Habitat Management Areas 9
- Allocations and Management Direction 10
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern 16
- Rationale Conclusion 19

Changes and Clarifications made between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD 19
- Significant Changes between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD 19
- Changes and clarifications between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD 20

Mitigation 27

Consultation and Coordination 27
- Tribal Government Consultation 27
- State Historic Preservation Office Coordination 28
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation 28
- Cooperating Agencies 29
- Governor's Consistency Review 29

RMP Amendment Monitoring 30

Public Involvement 30
- Project Website 30
- Scoping Process 31
- Draft RMP Amendment/EIS Comment Period 31
- Final EIS Availability Period and Proposed RMP Amendment Protest Period 31

Ongoing Actions 32

Availability of the Approved RMP Amendment 32
Approval 33

NEVADA/CALIFORNIA APPROVED RMP AMENDMENT 34

Habitat Management Area Alignments 34

APPENDICES 63

Appendix 1 – Table and Maps 63
Appendix 2 – Comparison of Prior Greater Sage-Grouse RMP Management Direction with Approved RMP Amendment 63
Appendix 3 – Greater Sage-grouse Monitoring Framework 63
Appendix 4 – Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Indicators and Benchmarks 63
Appendix 5 – Livestock Grazing Best Management Practices and Design Features and Supplemental Information 63
Appendix 6 – Glossary 63
Appendix 7 – References 63
Appendix 8 – U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Section 7 Concurrence Memo 63
Appendix 9 – BLM Adaptive Management Process 63
Appendix 10 – Summary of Public Comments on the Proposed Changes Between Proposed RMPA and ROD 63

Record of Decision

INTRODUCTION

This Nevada/California Record of Decision (ROD) and Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) Amendment amends a subset of greater sage-grouse (GRSG) goals, objectives, allocations and management direction in 11 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) RMPs in Nevada and Northeastern California. Following is a list of the plans that are amended by BLM district:

California RMPs

- Alturas RMP (BLM 2008a)
- Eagle Lake RMP (BLM 2008b)
- Surprise RMP (BLM 2008c)

Nevada RMPs

- Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area RMP (BLM 2004a)
- Carson City Consolidated RMP (BLM 2001a)
- Elko RMP (BLM 1987a)
- Ely RMP (BLM 2008d)
- Winnemucca RMP (BLM 2015)
- Shoshone-Eureka RMP (BLM 1986a)
- Tonopah RMP (BLM 1997a)
- Wells RMP (BLM 1985a)

This Approved RMP Amendment builds on the work that was completed in BLM's 2015 and 2019 GRSG RMP Amendments and responds to the loss of habitat and the declining population of the GRSG, a ground-dwelling bird that was under consideration by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). With more than 25 percent of the rangewide distribution of GRSG (Milligan et al. 2024), the Nevada and Northeastern California planning area plays a vital role in sustaining the species and connecting populations across the Great Basin and Snake River Plain Management Zones. Current information on GRSG distribution and habitat requirements is necessary to apply management decisions effectively and this planning effort incorporates scientific and biological knowledge gained since 2016, when the previous GRSG habitat model was published (Coates et al. 2016). Background on the prior GRSG planning processes can be found in the Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment and Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) in Chapter 1.2 GRSG Planning Background. The Approved RMP Amendment provides the Nevada and California BLM with locally relevant land use allocations that achieve rangewide GRSG conservation goals consistent with the BLM's multiple use and sustained yield mission and in support of coordinated GRSG management efforts with federal, state, local, and Tribal partners.

The Nevada and Northeastern California Approved RMP Amendment amends language relating to management direction and clarification for management of resources including special status species, vegetation, fire, renewable energy, and rights-of-way (ROWs). This RMP Amendment identifies updated habitat management areas that allow for the application of habitat conservation in areas where it will be

most beneficial and effective. Within these habitat management areas, updated rangewide management direction for the following resource topics will be applied: utility scale solar and wind development; fluid, saleable, and non-energy leasable mineral development; major and minor ROW development; livestock grazing; wild horses and burros; predation; mitigation; disturbance management protocols; adaptive management; criteria based management for non-habitat; updated habitat objectives, an updated lek buffer definition, and an updated monitoring framework. Additionally, Nevada and Northeast California are also updating management direction for lands and realty, nonenergy leasable minerals, and predation.

Throughout this planning process, the BLM consulted with Tribes, and engaged with cooperating agencies and the public, as described below. The signing of this Record of Decision (ROD) represents the conclusion of this planning process.

This ROD approves the BLM's proposal to implement the management direction presented in the attached Approved RMP Amendment in the Nevada and Northeastern California decision area. This Approved RMP Amendment was described as the Proposed RMP Amendment in the Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS that was released on November 15, 2024, with adjustments and clarifications made during the Governor's Consistency Review process and to align with changes in regulation and policy as described in the **Clarifications and Modifications** section below.

DECISION AREA

The planning area is the geographic area within which the BLM will make decisions. A planning area boundary includes all lands regardless of ownership, but the BLM can only make decisions on public lands and federal mineral estate within the agency's jurisdiction. This rangewide planning area amendment includes all lands within the boundaries of BLM field offices that contain GRSG habitat, excluding the Bi-state sage-grouse and the Columbia Basin sage-grouse, which are addressed in other planning efforts. The planning area for this RMP Amendment includes portions of California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, as shown in Map 1, **Appendix 1**, Table and Maps.

The decision area includes the lands within the planning area for which the BLM has authority to make land use and management decisions, including areas where BLM administers subsurface minerals. In Nevada and Northeastern California, the decision area for this Approved RMP Amendment applies to BLM-administered GRSG habitat management areas as shown in Map 2, **Appendix 1**, Table and Maps. The Nevada and Northeastern California decision area includes approximately 16,201,000 acres of lands administered by BLM Nevada and California located in 13 Nevada and 4 Northeastern California counties that include:

Nevada Counties:

- Churchill
- Elko
- Eureka
- Humboldt
- Lander
- Lincoln
- Lyon
- Mineral
- Nye
- Pershing
- Storey
- Washoe
- White Pine

California Counties:

- Modoc
- Lassen
- Plumas
- Sierra

DECISION

The decision is hereby made to approve the attached Greater Sage-grouse Rangewide Planning Approved RMP Amendment for Nevada and Northeastern California. This RMP Amendment was prepared under the regulations implementing the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) (43 CFR Part 1600). An environmental impact statement was prepared for this RMP Amendment in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969[1] and the planning regulations 43 CFR 161031-(b).

The BLM selected the RMP Amendment after careful consideration of input from cooperating agencies, consulting Tribes, the Governors of Nevada and California, and the public.

The decisions contained in the RMP Amendment are expressed as goals, objectives, allocations, and management directions. The decisions identified in the RMP Amendment are final and effective when this ROD is signed. The decisions contained in the RMP Amendment recognize and are consistent with valid existing rights. Future BLM decisions, including those that authorize third-party actions, would also be consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. The decisions in this Approved RMP are planning level decisions. Additional steps may need to be taken to implement on-the-ground activities including additional scientific design, environmental review, mitigation, and monitoring. The BLM will prepare appropriate documentation where necessary to comply with NEPA when making implementation-level decisions.

The Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS did not reconsider all existing GRSG management actions in the 2015 and 2019 RMP Amendments consistent with BLM's planning criteria and purpose and need, detailed below. Management decisions in the 2015 and 2019 RMP Amendments that are not amended will remain in place (refer to **Appendix 2**, Comparison of Prior Greater Sage-Grouse RMP Management Direction with Approved RMP Amendment).

PURPOSE AND NEED

As required by NEPA, the BLM identified the purpose and need for this RMP Amendment and developed a range of alternatives to meet the purpose and need. The preliminary purpose and need statement in the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS was refined in the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS in response to cooperating agency and public input, and reads as follows:

The BLM's purpose is to amend certain goals, objectives, allocations, and management direction for GRSG management in its RMPs to respond to updated scientific information and changing land uses and provide for consistent and effective rangewide conservation based on biological information that is responsive to locally relevant habitat variability. Following an internal review of the effectiveness of 2015 and 2019 RMP Amendment decisions, including the degree to which those decisions sufficiently addressed threats to GRSG habitats and continued population declines, while balancing the BLM's ability to manage public lands for other uses, and as informed by updated scientific findings and feedback received from Tribal, federal, state, and local agencies and the public during the scoping period, the BLM proposes to amend the following RMP elements:

- Clarify the existing GRSG RMP goal
- GRSG habitat management area alignments to incorporate new science and improve alignment along state boundaries along with the associated major land use allocations, including management for non-habitat within habitat management areas

[1] The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA are rescinded, effective April 11, 2025. The BLM has complied with applicable procedures/ regulations, including DOI's procedures/regulations implementing NEPA at 43 CFR Part 46, to meet the agency's obligations under NEPA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq.

- Adoption of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) definition of "lek" and "lek status"
- Mitigation
- GRSG habitat objectives
- Disturbance management protocols
- Fluid mineral development and leasing objectives
- Fluid mineral leasing waivers, exceptions, and modifications (WEMs)
- Renewable energy development
- ROWs
- Minimizing threats from predation
- Livestock grazing
- Wild horse and burro management
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
- Adaptive Management

Some management concerns are localized to circumstances in individual states and the ecological diversity across the sagebrush ecosystem. As such, the purpose of this planning effort also includes amending specific RMP management actions associated with state-specific circumstances to facilitate GRSG habitat conservation efforts. Beyond the rangewide considerations detailed above, states considered additional targeted amendments to existing management direction. Each state determined the need to amend management actions independently and based on a review of updated scientific information, changing land uses, and locally relevant habitat variability. Management actions targeted for amendment in some states include saleable minerals, fire and fuels, vegetation and invasive species, lands and realty actions, project screening, lek buffers, and interagency coordination. Inclusion of a management category for amendment in one state does not necessitate consideration of this category in other states or the consideration of the category rangewide. See Section 2.5 of the Final EIS, State-Specific Circumstances, for more information.

Section 102 of the FLPMA, as amended, establishes a congressional policy objective that2 BLM manage public lands "in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archeological values; that, where appropriate, will preserve and protect certain public lands in their natural condition; that will provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals; and that will provide for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and use." BLM's Special Status Species Manual, M-6840, further directs the BLM to "emphasize proactive conservation for BLM sensitive species to help ensure these species do not need to be listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA." Specifically, the BLM's Wildlife and Fisheries Management Manual, M-6500, directs the BLM to "conserve rare, vulnerable, and representative habitats, plant communities, and ecosystems," with specific objectives to "develop and implement plans to ensure that the characteristics of rare, threatened, or representative habitat types are maintained," and to "collaborate with other agencies, the States, and private groups to ensure protection of the best representative habitats/ecosystem/plant communities for each area." The BLM's Special Status Species Management Manual, M-6840 (2008), states "the BLM shall designate

[2] This sentence has been updated to more accurately describe Section 102 of the FLPMA. The purpose and need presented in the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS read "Section 102 of the FLPMA, as amended, requires the BLM to manage public lands…".

Bureau sensitive species and implement measures to conserve these species and their habitats...to promote their conservation and reduce the likelihood and need for such species to be listed pursuant to the ESA." 3

The BLM is therefore amending RMPs to:

- Address continued GRSG habitat losses, which can contribute to GRSG population declines. While GRSG populations experience natural fluctuations, monitoring indicates the most recent nadirs (low point of population cycles) are lower than the prior nadirs in most states. The U.S. Geological Survey4 analyzed state-collected lek data and reported estimated rangewide population declines of nearly 80 percent from 1966-2021 and of 41 percent from 2002-2021. While some GRSG populations are stable to increasing, over 87 percent of areas throughout their range had declining populations since 2002. The quantity and quality of available habitat, as well as non-habitat factors such as prolonged drought, can affect the size and trend of GRSG populations. Satellite data analysis shows sagebrush availability across all land ownerships declined by approximately 3 percent (1.9 million acres) between 2012 and 2018. Nearly 60 percent of the sagebrush losses (approximately 1.1 million acres rangewide) occurred on BLM-administered lands. In the years 2016-2024, over 9.2 million acres5 in sage-grouse range were burned by wildfire. Wildfire results in the greatest amount of direct habitat loss compared to other threats. This loss of habitat limits GRSG populations to smaller areas from which to obtain the needed habitat characteristics of food and cover. Constraining populations into smaller habitat areas accentuates impacts from other threats, which can then affect population trends. The BLM's 2021 Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Implementation Rangewide Monitoring Report for 2015-20206 identified 42 population triggers that had been tripped through 2020. Identifying, if possible, and responding to causal factors where population triggers have been tripped is critical to manage habitat to support state population objectives. In addition, habitat triggers were tripped sixteen times, attributable to sagebrush loss due to wildfires. The Monitoring Report estimated habitat loss of less than one percent in GRSG priority habitat management areas (PHMA) rangewide due to anthropogenic disturbance, although losses due to wildfire were more extensive. The anthropogenic loss on BLM lands is less than what scientific literature has identified as the threshold where GRSG abandon leks (Kirol et al. 2020). Disturbance from infrastructure in General Habitat Management Areas (GHMA) and other state-specific habitat management area designations averaged approximately 1.58 percent. To help address the continued losses of and impacts to habitat, the BLM proactively conducted sagebrush vegetation treatments

[3] The September 2024 revisions to Special Status Species Management Manual M-6840 were rescinded in December 2025. The associated quoted policy direction was therefore updated to reflect the language from in the 2008 Manual. The intent of this statement, that it is BLM policy to minimize the need for listing under the ESA, has not changed.

[4] Coates, P.S., Prochazka, B.G., Aldridge, C.L., O'Donnell, M.S., Edmunds, D.R., Monroe, A.P., Hanser, S.E., Wiechman, L.A., and Chenaille, M.P., 2023, Rangewide population trend analysis for greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*)—Updated 1960–2022: U.S. Geological Survey Data Report 1175, 17 p., https://doi.org/10.3133/dr1175.

[5] Total acres across the range of GRSG, including the Bi-State and Columbia Basin populations that are not included in this planning effort. Acres include all burned areas within the sage-grouse range maps, not limited to the RMP identified habitat management areas or just areas of sagebrush and sagebrush associated habitats. Acres are also inclusive of all ownerships, not just BLM-administered lands.

[6] Herren, V., E. Kachergis, A. Titolo, K. Mayne, S. Glazer, K. Lambert, B. Newman, and B. Franey. 2021. Greater sage-grouse plan implementation: Rangewide monitoring report for 2015–2020. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Denver, CO.

on over 5.8 million acres7 from 2016-2024. These included conifer removal, installation of fuel breaks, invasive species removal, habitat restoration, riparian restoration, and habitat protection.

- Ensure habitat management areas and associated decisions incorporate recent relevant science to prioritize management where it will provide conservation benefit and durability when considering the effects of extreme weather conditions including drought. Since the 2015 and 2019 planning efforts, hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific publications on GRSG and management of their habitats have been published. Some of these new publications are consistent with science the BLM previously considered while others identify new information. Several provide new spatial information on important population and habitat parameters for GRSG. USGS also compiled and summarized peer-reviewed journal articles, data products, and formal technical reports related to GRSG since January 2015 (Teige et al. 2023). The BLM considered this new information and relevant science in developing and analyzing proposed management on BLM-administered lands.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Draft RMP Amendment and Draft EIS and the Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS considered a range of alternatives designed to meet the BLM's purpose and need to respond to updated scientific information and changing land uses and provide for consistent and effective rangewide GRSG conservation based on biological information that is responsive to locally relevant habitat variability (refer to Purpose and Need, Section 1.4.2 of the Final EIS). The Draft RMP Amendment and Draft EIS analyzed six alternatives. The Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS analyzed those same alternatives along with a seventh alternative, the Proposed RMP Amendment, which was developed using elements from the other alternatives and in response to public and cooperating agency comments on the Draft RMP Amendment and Draft EIS.

The Proposed RMP Amendment alternative in the Final EIS was within the range of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and did not represent new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns bearing on the proposed action or its impacts, could have been reasonably anticipated for consideration by the public, and was responsive to public and cooperating agency feedback received on the Draft RMP Amendment and Draft EIS. Therefore, the BLM determined that adding the Proposed RMP Amendment between the Draft EIS and Final EIS did not necessitate supplementation.

Following is a summary of the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS. Section 2.3, Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes alternatives that were considered but not analyzed in detail.

Alternative 1 (Applicable Decisions from the 2015 Approved RMP Amendment)

Alternative 1 included the applicable decisions from the 2015 Approved RMP Amendments that are proposed for amendment under this planning effort due to the U.S. District Court of Idaho's preliminary injunction preventing implementation of the 2019 Approved RMP Amendment (refer to Alternative 2 summary below) the BLM is currently implementing the 2015 Approved RMP Amendment. This includes designation of some areas of PHMA as Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFA) with a recommendation to withdraw them from location and entry under the Mining Law of 1872. Additionally, each project resulting in disruption

[7] Acres include areas of treatment funded by the BLM. While these are largely on BLM-administered lands, funding often is used on non-BLM-administered lands adjacent to treatments on BLM-administered lands. In addition, these acres may include double-counting different treatments on the same acres (e.g., conifer removal, followed by seeding counts as two different types of treatments that may occur on the same acres).

to or loss of GRSG habitat must be mitigated to provide a net conservation gain, which would require use of compensatory mitigation.

Alternative 2 – No Action (Applicable Decisions from the 2019 Approved RMP Amendment)

Alternative 2 is the No-Action Alternative and includes the applicable decisions from the 2019 GRSG RODs/Approved RMP Amendments except in Montana/Dakotas, which did not amend their RMPs in 2019. This is the No Action because it reflects the management language currently in the BLM's approved land use plans. The U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho has issued a preliminarily injunction, preventing the BLM from implementing the 2019 amendments, but not vacating them or their RODs. Because the 2019 RODs/Approved RMP Amendments were not vacated, they are the existing approved management plans. Under this alternative the BLM would apply the management from the 2019 Approved RMP Amendments. SFAs would be removed from the BLM RMPs in all states except Oregon and Montana; these areas would still be managed with all the protections of PHMA but would no longer include a recommendation for withdrawal (including in the Oregon SFAs). For projects that result in disruption to or loss of GRSG habitat, projects would be managed to minimize or eliminate threats to GRSG, or to improve the condition of GRSG habitat across the planning area, only requiring compensatory mitigation if required by the State, federal law, or if volunteered by the proponent.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 provides the most protective measures to preserve GRSG and its habitat of the alternatives analyzed. Alternative 3 would update the HMA boundaries based on new information and science that has become available since the 2015 and 2019 planning efforts. All HMAs would be managed as PHMA. The BLM would close PHMA to new fluid mineral leasing, saleable minerals/mineral materials permitting, and nonenergy leasable minerals leasing, although development associated with existing permits and leases would not be precluded. PHMA would be recommended for withdrawal from location and entry under the Mining Law of 1872 and unavailable for livestock grazing. PHMA would also be ROW exclusion areas. Where there are currently designated wild horse and burro herd management areas overlapping PHMA, the wild horse and burro herd management area would become a Herd Area that is not managed for wild horses and burros. Under Alternative 3, the BLM would designate 32 GRSG habitat ACECs.

Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would update the HMA boundaries and associated management based on new information and science that became available since the 2015 and 2019 efforts. While many of the allocations would be similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, the habitat management areas are updated to reflect new science. In addition, management associated with some of the major minimization measures (e.g., disturbance cap and adaptive management) is adjusted to address cross-boundary coordination of shared populations, rangewide biological and managerial concerns based on monitoring and experience gained from implementing management for GRSG since 2015. Alternative 4 allowed compensatory mitigation to be used under specific conditions. Additional compensatory mitigation may be required where habitat and/or population adaptive management thresholds have been met. Areas previously identified as SFAs are generally managed as PHMA. The primary difference between management of SFAs in the 2015 Plans and PHMAs in this planning effort is that PHMA would not include a recommendation for withdrawal or prioritization strategies for oil and gas leasing and grazing permit renewals. For projects resulting in disruption to or loss of GRSG habitat, they would be managed to at least achieve no net loss of GRSG habitat, which could include compensatory mitigation.

Alternative 5

Alternative 5 was identified as the preferred alternative in the Draft EIS. Alternative 5 considers other potential alignments of habitat management areas and associated management to try to balance GRSG conservation with public land uses. If state governments updated the GRSG management area boundaries in their specific state plans, the BLM is considering those boundaries on public lands in Alternative 5. HMAs are similar to but refined from Alternative 4 and restrictions would generally be similar to Alternative 4; with the exception of Wyoming which would follow the oil and gas management direction in Alternative 2; and the fact that Alternative 5 considered options with fewer restrictions on resource uses and provided more opportunities for considering compensatory mitigation to offset impacts on GRSG and its habitat than Alternative 4. Areas previously identified as SFAs are generally managed as PHMA. The primary difference between management of SFAs in the 2015 Plans and PHMAs in this planning effort is that PHMA would not include a recommendation for withdrawal or prioritization strategies for oil and gas leasing and grazing permit renewals. For projects resulting in disruption to or loss of GRSG habitat, similar to Alternative 4, they would be managed to at least achieve no net loss of GRSG habitat, which could include compensatory mitigation, but there would be more flexibility to when and how compensatory mitigation would be conducted.

Alternative 6

Under Alternative 6, management for all habitat management areas and the resource topics being considered in the range of alternatives would be the same as described for Alternative 5 except that under Alternative 6, 32 ACECs are proposed for designation. The same ACECs proposed for designation under Alternative 3 would be considered but the management direction for these areas would be less restrictive compared to Alternative 3.

Nevada and Northeastern California specific items

For BLM Nevada and California, Alternatives 3 and 6 included the same ACECs, which included 5,364,627 acres and some variations from the rangewide decisions apply to all Alternatives for special status species, vegetation, fire, lands and realty, mineral resources, predation, and renewable energy (see Appendix 5 of the FEIS for a list of the 14 variations).

Proposed RMP Amendment

The Final EIS Proposed RMP Amendment modified protections for GRSG and its habitat from the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 5). The Proposed RMP Amendment identified PHMA as an exclusion with exceptions for solar and wind and no surface occupancy (NSO) for fluid minerals with exceptions. PHMA remained an avoidance area for major ROW with exceptions. Since the Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS, the BLM added additional detail on the processes and requirements for compensatory mitigation, site-scale assessments, adaptive management, and fluid mineral WEMs to promote rangewide consistency and ensure proper tracking. Some areas within PHMA were identified as PHMA with limited exceptions. Within these areas, there were no exceptions to the solar and wind exclusion allocation or to the NSO allocation for fluid minerals. These areas were also exclusion areas for major ROW.

As described in the **Changes and Clarifications** section below, these areas were determined to be unnecessary after considering information included in protest letters and Governor Consistency Reviews. Protections provided by HMA designations are thought to be sufficient to avoid development threats and negative impacts from extreme weather conditions such as drought.

For BLM Nevada and BLM California, the Proposed RMP Amendment included some variations from the rangewide decisions (see Appendix 5 of the FEIS for a list of the 14 variations).

RATIONALE FOR DECISION

The Approved RMP Amendment provides management direction that best meets the BLM's purpose of addressing updated scientific information and changing land uses, including information and uses not considered or addressed in the BLM's 2015 and 2019 amendments, while providing for consistent and effective rangewide GRSG conservation that is responsive to locally-relevant habitat variability. The Approved RMP Amendment also best meets the need to address GRSG habitat loss, and the BLM believes this management approach is better than previous management. While GRSG populations experience natural fluctuations, monitoring indicates the most recent low point of population cycles (nadirs) are lower than the prior nadirs in most states. The BLM manages approximately half of the remaining GRSG habitats and between 2015 and 2020 nearly 60 percent (1.1 million acres) of all sagebrush losses (approximately 1.9 million acres rangewide) occurred on BLM-administered lands as a result of wildfire. The Approved RMP Amendment addresses this issue and provides new management that allows for the conservation of GRSG habitat while balancing the BLM's ability to manage public lands for other uses in accordance with FLPMA. The Approved RMP Amendment responds to statute, regulations, and national policy, including Section 102 of FLPMA; BLM's Wildlife and Fisheries Management Manual, M-6500; BLM's Special Status Species Management Manual, M-6840; Nevada and California-specific habitat conditions and threats; and Nevada and California State government GRSG policies and management priorities including the Nevada Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan and Conservation Credit System (CCS), Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 232.162, Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 232.400 – 232.480), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife Species of Special Concern Management. The Approved RMP Amendment reflects a high degree of collaboration and input received from the cooperating federal, state, and local governments; the feedback received from Tribal governments; and from the over 39,000 public comments received on the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS. The Approved RMP Amendment provides the necessary protection for GRSG habitat considering anticipated development threats and negative impacts from extreme weather conditions including drought while also ensuring an appropriate balance of public land uses. For all the reasons included in this decision, the BLM believes the management approach in the Approved RMP Amendment is better than the previous management set forth in the 2015 and 2019 amendments that is being amended.

Following, in more detail, are the ways in which the key components of the Approved RMP Amendment incorporate updated science and changing land uses, reduce habitat loss on BLM-administered lands, and incorporate feedback from Tribal, federal, state, and local governments and the public in an effort to develop a plan that has durability across the GRSG range while responding to the specific habitat, development threats, and public land uses in the Nevada and Northeastern California planning area.

Habitat Management Areas

The Approved RMP Amendment will reduce habitat loss on BLM-administered lands by identifying updated HMAs where GRSG habitat conservation measures will be implemented in areas where it will provide the greatest conservation value for this species. These updated HMAs respond to updated monitoring and scientific data (e.g., Coates et al. 2021; Cross et al. 2018; Cross et al. 2022; Doherty et al. 2016; Oyler-McCance et al. 2022; Row et al. 2018; Palmquist et al. 2021; Rigge et al. 2021) and reflect the input of the federal and state land management and wildlife management agencies across the ten-state planning area, including Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Within these habitat management areas, updated management direction to conserve GRSG habitat will be applied to utility scale solar and wind development; fluid, saleable, and non-energy leasable mineral

development; major and minor ROW development; livestock grazing; wild horses and burros; predation; mitigation; disturbance cap; adaptive management; criteria-based management for non-habitat; and updated habitat objectives and lek definitions. Additionally, the Nevada and Northeastern California planning area is also updating management direction for vegetation and fire management.

The Approved RMP Amendment identifies two rangewide habitat management areas, Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA)[8] and General Habitat Management Areas (GHMA), and the Nevada and Northeastern California specific Other Habitat Management Areas (OHMA) that respond to local habitat priorities. PHMA have the highest value for maintaining sustainable GRSG populations and can include breeding, late brood-rearing, winter concentration areas, and migration or connectivity corridors. GHMA are lands that are or have the potential to become occupied seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA, managed to sustain GRSG populations. OHMA includes areas with appropriate environmental conditions for GRSG that are less used by GRSG or have marginal habitat suitability.

PHMA, GHMA, and OHMA were identified using a science-based modeling process developed by the US Geological Survey (USGS; Milligan et al. 2024). The model is informed by the following: resource selection information informed by telemetry locations from radio- or satellite-marked GRSG; the relationship of those telemetry points with associated habitat characteristics such as land cover composition, water resources, habitat configuration, elevation, and topography (each at multiple spatial scales related to the observed GRSG movement patterns); and a space use index based on GRSG breeding densities at leks. The modeled combination of these habitat characteristics and site use resulted in a model output of potential management prioritization scenarios (e.g., PHMA, GHMA and OHMA). Model development was an iterative process that included multiple revisions informed by state agencies, cooperating agencies, and federal partners. The BLM held an in-person cooperating agency and USGS meeting to discuss and provide input on the modeling process. The published product has been adopted by the State of Nevada and BLM Nevada and California.

The identified HMA boundaries reflect more than six years of additional field data collected since the last published version (Coates et al. 2016) and advances in methodology to produce the HMA model (refer to Map 3, **Appendix I**, Table and Maps).

In Nevada and Northeastern California, there are 9,125,656 acres of PHMA; 2,186,846 acres of GHMA; and 3,822,033 acres of OHMA. These habitat management areas form the cornerstone of focusing BLM's GRSG conservation efforts in the areas where they will be the most beneficial and effective.

Allocations and Management Direction

In identifying the management allocations and direction that would apply in the PHMA, GHMA, and OHMAs to meet the purpose and need, the BLM considered the effects of the alternatives identified in the Final EIS (Chapter 4 in the Final EIS) and the feedback received from the public, cooperating agencies, and Tribal governments on the analyses in the Draft EIS. Based on the analyses and feedback received on the Draft EIS based on the Governor's Consistency Review process on the Final EIS, and to improve alignment with Federal policies, BLM felt it was necessary to increase protections for GRSG, particularly in PHMA, from those identified in BLM's preferred alternative (Alternative 5) in the Draft EIS. Specifically, the BLM's

[8] As described in the **Changes and Clarifications** section below, in the Proposed RMP Amendment, the BLM identified areas within PHMA that would receive increased protections to support conservation of GRSG habitat referred to as PHMA with limited exceptions. This management approach is not included in the Approved RMP Amendment; these areas are all identified as PHMA.

Approved RMP Amendment increases protections in PHMA allocations and management direction from the Preferred Alternative identified in the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS by:

- changing the PHMA utility scale solar and wind allocations from avoidance to exclusion with specific exception criteria for potential ancillary solar development;
- expanding the definition of major ROWs to include transmission and distribution line ROWs and narrowing the exceptions for allowing development;
- before granting exceptions to disturbance protocol or cap, the exceptions must receive BLM State Director concurrence, exceptions must be tracked, and conditions for compensatory mitigation must be met where required by the State of Nevada;
- updating habitat objectives to require the identification of multiple lines of evidence to determine overall habitat suitability when completing site-scale assessments;
- more explicitly defining habitat inputs for adaptive management direction and clarifying the coordination that will occur with state wildlife agencies; and
- clarifying the fluid minerals WEMs management direction to promote rangewide consistency and ensure proper tracking of WEMs.

The Approved RMP Amendment is based on the Proposed RMP Amendment in the Final EIS (with clarifications and changes as noted in the **Changes and Clarifications** section), which incorporates management direction approaches from all of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft RMP Amendment and EIS and provides the appropriate suite of management direction to conserve GRSG habitat. The allocations and management direction are designed to minimize surface disturbance while addressing habitat needs and development threats and public land uses in Nevada and Northeastern California. This will promote habitat conservation in a manner that allows for public land uses where appropriate and in accordance with BLM's multiple use and sustained yield mission. Chapter 4 of the Final EIS details the Approved RMP Amendment's potential impacts on GRSG.

Habitat Management

The Approved RMP Amendment clarifies habitat management objectives and makes them consistent across the GRSG range and provides associated management direction that guides a consistent approach to promote the long-term durability of BLM's conservation efforts. The updated objectives identify what constitutes suitable GRSG habitat and addresses seasonal habitats, dispersal, and migration and the need to limit habitat disturbance and fragmentation. The updated objectives identify the scale at which the different habitat components must be maintained. Compared to the 2015 and 2019 habitat objectives, the updated objectives acknowledge that habitat characteristics vary based on spatial scale, and that the conditions that characterize suitable habitat at the site scale vary based on ecological conditions throughout the range. The management direction provides methods for assessing habitat suitability through the Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) and the use of Habitat Indicator Tables (in Appendix 4) to improve and restore habitat. Because of this, the Appendix 4 Habitat Indicators Table was updated and will be periodically reviewed to incorporate the best available science in coordination with applicable federal, state, local, and tribal agencies. Additionally, the values provided in the Appendix 4 Habitat Indicators Table, as updated, will be used for HAF assessments. The Approved RMP Amendment focuses the objective on rangewide management for suitable habitat, but allows for local adaptation for the specific vegetation conditions that define suitable habitat throughout a GRSG range with diverse vegetation, topography, and ecology to be informed and adjusted by local and continuing research. These objectives and management direction respond to updated

science and feedback received from cooperating agencies, including the USFWS, the NDOW, CDFW, and BLM's implementation experience.

Solar, Wind, Fluid Mineral, and Major ROWs

PHMA are exclusion areas for utility scale solar and wind energy and there is no surface occupancy (NSO) allocation for fluid minerals. However, there are exceptions for solar energy generation that are ancillary to other approved uses (e.g., fluid mineral development, data centers), and for the fluid mineral if specified criteria can be met. PHMA is an avoidance area for major ROWs with few exceptions for allowing development. GHMA are avoidance for solar and wind development and open with minor stipulations for fluid minerals. Major ROWs in GHMA are open with minimization measures.

In addition to the changes in fluid mineral allocations and WEMs, the over-arching fluid mineral objective no longer requires prioritization outside of PHMA and GHMA. Appendix C in the BLM's planning handbook (BLM-1601-1) identifies land use planning decisions for fluid minerals. A land use plan is to identify, "consistent with the goals and objectives for natural resources," areas that are 1) open to leasing subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form; 2) open to leasing subject to moderate constraints such as seasonal and controlled use restrictions; 3) open to leasing subject to major constraints such as no-surface-occupancy (NSO); 4) closed to leasing. The handbook also notes, similar to language from the Energy Policy Act of 2005, that "when applying leasing restrictions, the least restrictive constraint to meet the resource protection objective should be used" (BLM-1601-1 Appendix C page 24). The combination of open to leasing subject to NSO stipulation and the prioritization objective created a situation that has been confusing to the public over whether PHMA is open to leasing or not, and with what stipulations. Additionally, the planning handbook describes how an implementation strategy—not the RMP itself—is the appropriate tool for the BLM to prioritize RMP decisions to help achieve desired outcomes, taking into account the availability of existing or anticipated staff and budget resources. Therefore removing the prioritization process from the RMP aligns with current BLM planning guidance. This approach is also consistent with recent amendments to the Mineral Leasing Act through the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (P.L. 119-21, Sec. 50101) ("OBBBA"), which limit the BLM's discretion for leasing parcels nominated in expressions of interest. Section 50101(d) of the OBBBA directs the BLM, acting on behalf of the Secretary, to make parcels known or believed to contain oil or gas deposits available for leasing "not later than 18 months" after receipt of an expression of interest, provided that the BLM "determines that the parcel of land is open to oil and gas leasing under the approved resource management plan applicable to the planning area in which the parcel of land is located that is in effect on the date on which the expression of interest was submitted." Retaining the prioritization process following enactment of section 50101(d) would potentially confuse the public and, for parcels nominated in expressions of interest, would likely be inconsistent or in tension with this new statutory direction. Finally, the analysis in the FEIS shows that prioritization is unnecessary for the BLM to provide sufficient protection for greater sage-grouse. The prioritization process provides no certain or durable protection to PHMA, and the BLM is retaining the stipulations associated with surface occupancy and disturbance cap.

Moreover, not including specific leasing prioritization language or a specific leasing strategy in the RMP does not remove the RMP's desired condition to manage public lands for suitable GRSG habitat at the HAF mid-, fine- and site-scales. Fluid mineral leasing would be considered in GRSG habitat management areas consistent with the Secretary's discretion to consider leasing or not leasing available public lands under the Mineral Leasing Act (as amended), subject to the limits on that discretion resulting from the amendments to the Mineral Leasing Act through the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. If lands are considered for lease, the action

and any subsequent development would comply with applicable BLM regulations and policies, and conform to the RMP GRSG goals, objectives, stipulations, and management actions.

These allocations respond to concerns raised regarding the threats associated with these uses (habitat loss, habitat avoidance, disturbance, etc.) while also ensuring that where appropriate, these uses can be allowed.

Locatable, Nonenergy Leasable, and Saleable Minerals and Materials

All HMAs are open to locatable mineral development in accordance with the 1872 Mining Law, unless already withdrawn. Within PHMA, no new nonenergy leasable mineral development is allowed unless the new nonenergy leasable mineral lease meets one of the allocation exception criteria outlined in **MD SSS 5** or the new nonenergy leasable mineral has coincident occurrence within existing disturbance and is subject to a non-competitive lease. No additional direct or indirect impacts shall result from extraction of the new nonenergy leasable mineral. The expansion of existing pits is allowed. GHMA is open to nonenergy leasable mineral development with the application of state-specific minimization measures.

PHMA is closed for saleable mineral development, unless it meets one of the allocation exception criteria outlined in **MD SSS 5,** but open for new free use permits and open for the expansion of existing pits. GHMA is open for saleable mineral development with the application of minimization measures. This mineral management direction responds to state-specific circumstances, input received from cooperating agencies, and the public. This direction will reduce habitat loss and/or disturbance in PHMA habitat, while allowing use with the application of appropriate minimization measures in GHMA, thereby balancing necessary GRSG protections with public land use.

Livestock Grazing

The Approved RMP Amendment provides management direction for livestock grazing to promote GRSG habitat conservation when applying the existing BLM policies and approaches for livestock grazing. For example, the use of targeted grazing to manage fuel loads and fuel continuity is an example of using livestock to protect valuable habitat. Specifically, the livestock grazing direction provides an objective to manage livestock grazing in a manner that meets or makes progress toward meeting the Land Health Standard for special status species and applies guidelines that address restoring or enhancing GRSG habitat. The management direction in the Approved RMP Amendment calls for considering GRSG and their habitat when developing allotment management plans and other similar implementation planning that is done to meet or make progress toward BLM's Land Health Standards (LHS). This includes considering the vegetation needs of GRSG and ways of implementing range improvements such as fencing in a manner that is least impactful to GRSG. Habitat Indicators and Benchmarks used in assessing habitat conditions are based on habitat selection that may not be achievable or applicable in all areas. Site-specific benchmarks are based on the site's ecological potential informed by ecological site descriptions (ESDs) and associated state-and-transition models (STMs), and the site's current ecological state. Future scientific publications are expected to include additional details on breeding phenology, nesting and brood success, habitat use, and insect abundance. For example, publications are anticipated within a year or more resulting from the 10-year Grouse-Grazing Study which published a Final Report in June 2025 (Conway et al. 2025). As a result, updates to indicators and benchmark values may occur to seasonal dates for lekking, nesting, and late brood-rearing, and habitat characteristics for sagebrush cover, perennial grass and perennial forb height and cover.

In PHMA, when fully processing grazing authorizations where livestock grazing is found to be a significant causal factor in not meeting the special status species (SSS) standard, the NEPA analysis will include an alternative that identifies specific thresholds and responses to maintain or move PHMA toward providing

suitable GRSG habitat. The Approved RMP Amendment also provides a suite of GRSG specific design features and best management practices for consideration and use when conducting livestock grazing (refer to **Appendix 5**, Livestock Grazing Management Best Management Practices and Design Features).

The livestock grazing management direction was identified in response to cooperating agency and public feedback, updated scientific and monitoring data, and builds on and clarifies how the existing management direction for livestock grazing will continue to be implemented in manner that conserves GRSG habitat.

Wild Horse and Burro Management

The Approved RMP Amendment provides management direction for wild horse and burro (WH&B) management that provides additional, specific direction regarding how to promote GRSG habitat conservation when applying the existing BLM policies and approaches for WH&B management. Specifically, the management direction for WH&B seeks to address areas within GRSG habitat where WH&B are a significant causal factor in not meeting LHS. Scientific literature has found that managing WH&B at or below appropriate management levels minimizes negative impacts on GRSG population trends (Coates et al. 2021, Beck et al. 2024). Where GRSG habitat overlaps with WH&B habitat, the Approved RMP Amendment calls for managing WH&B populations within established appropriate management levels and to achieve or make significant progress toward achieving LHS. The management direction also directs the prioritization of WH&B gathers in PHMA unless removals are necessary in other areas to address higher priority issues, including herd health impacts.

The WH&B direction was identified in response to cooperating agency and public feedback and updated scientific and monitoring data. It builds on and clarifies how the existing management direction for WH&B will be implemented in a manner that conserves GRSG habitat.

Mitigation, Disturbance Management Protocol or Cap, Predation, Adaptive Management

As part of the comprehensive approach to promoting GRSG conservation, the Approved RMP Amendment also updates the BLM's GRSG mitigation, disturbance management protocols, and adaptive management processes. These updates are in response to public and cooperating agency feedback, changes in BLM policies, and experience the BLM has gained implementing these programs. For example, BLM has learned that mitigation is most effective when it can be applied where the habitat and population impacts are occurring. BLM has found the results of calculating the disturbance management protocols at the HAF fine-scale to be the most useful scale of analysis. Impacts from an increasing raven population have been shown to have substantive impacts on GRSG (Coates et al. 2016; O'Neil et al. 2023) and there are active efforts by state and federal partners to control raven population growth. To assist with these efforts and improve GRSG habitat, the Approved RMP Amendment creates new management direction that addresses the predation risks associated with disturbance activities in GRSG habitat.

The mitigation direction in the Approved RMP Amendment adopts the mitigation language from Alternative 2, focusing on avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, and reducing GRSG impacts, but only considering compensatory mitigation when voluntarily offered by a proponent, required by a law other than FLPMA, or to meet a State recommendation or requirement. This change is to align more closely with BLM's statutory authority. This results in working with the States to maintain existing habitat as the initial approach to GRSG management, then working closely with the State plans and authorities to address the potential for compensation. The Approved RMP Amendment retains the entire breadth of mitigation tools to be implemented through conformance with the RMP, applicable statutes, and consistent with state plans and policies. Prior to granting fluid mineral exception number 2 or the exception to the disturbance protocol/cap,

the criteria noted in the RMP related to compensatory mitigation voluntarily offered by the proponent would need to be documented, including the need to benefit the affected populations; these clarifications were made in response to cooperating agency feedback, BLM's experience implementing mitigation, and updated policies and science (e.g., Coates et al 2021b). Adopting this mitigation strategy more closely aligns with the BLM's mitigation authorities, FLPMA requirements for consistency with State plans, and reflects the primary mitigation approach of avoiding and minimizing impacts through application of RMP allocations.

The Approved RMP Amendment incorporates a 3% disturbance management protocol (DMP) in the State of Nevada for GRSG PHMAs. This protocol is intended to provide for a 3 percent limitation on disturbance with exceptions, including those where a net conservation gain to the species can be achieved, as a component of compliance with a state mitigation plan, program, or authority, such as the Nevada Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan and Conservation Credit System (CCS) as required by Nevada regulation[9] and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law and valid existing rights. This means that the BLM would not apply the disturbance protocol in a manner that would interfere with any valid existing rights. The protocol provides a mechanism to monitor the amount of disturbance and identify where avoidance of additional disturbance or restoration of previous disturbance is warranted, consistent with BLM management. It also provides information for the consideration of cumulative impacts.

In the State of California, the Approved RMP Amendment updates the disturbance cap direction and sets a 3% cap at the project scale and 3% at the HAF fine-scale within PHMA. When these disturbance caps are met, new infrastructure projects would be deferred to the extent allowable under applicable laws or valid existing rights. Similarly to the Nevada Protocol, the BLM would not apply the disturbance cap in a manner that would interfere with any valid existing rights. The Approved RMP Amendment directs how the disturbance cap calculation will be done and identifies disturbance cap exceptions and related criteria.

If during ongoing BLM, NDOW and/or CDFW monitoring it is found that unanticipated effects to GRSG are occurring, despite the ongoing implementation of GRSG RMP Amendment direction from 2015, 2019, and this Approved RMP Amendment, this Amendment provides a method for BLM to address those impacts before they become severe or irreversible through adaptive management. The adaptive management direction is based on updated science examining population trend anomalies (Coates et al. 2021) and was developed with significant feedback from cooperating agencies, including the Nevada Sagebrush Ecological Technical Team (NV SETT). The adaptive management direction identifies thresholds and responses and a process for coordinating with the states of Nevada and California to reduce and reverse impacts to GRSG and its habitat. The BLM is retaining the threshold limits for habitat loss or modification as in previous plans, although at a scale that is more meaningful to local populations.

The Approved RMP Amendment also addresses the secondary impact to GRSG from predation when habitat disturbance occurs (USFWS 2023). The management direction for predation responds to public and cooperating agency feedback that the BLM needed to address this topic as part of this amendment effort. The Approved RMP Amendment requires the application of minimization measures to new and existing projects to minimize threats from predators that pose a threat to GRSG and its habitat consistent with applicable law. In PHMA, for new, expanded, or renewal of existing energy or transmission related energy, mining and infrastructure projects, the project proponent is required to submit a predator subsidy management plan to minimize habitat loss and predator populations associated with the project. The

[9] Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 232.162 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 232.400 – 232.480

predator management direction will help the BLM ensure that when projects have the potential to negatively impact GRSG, appropriate design features and mitigation measures are put in place. The BLM does not have authority over predator control; however the BLM will continue to cooperate with other agencies should direct predator control be necessary.

The Approved RMP Amendment for mitigation, disturbance protocol/cap, predation, and adaptive management provides BLM with a comprehensive suite of tools to ensure that GRSG conservation measures are effective and the BLM is able to be responsive to anticipated threats as well as unanticipated impacts.

In addition to the rangewide direction, Nevada and Northeastern California addressed several additional resource topics including special status species management, vegetation, and fire. These changes resulted from bi-weekly meetings held with cooperating agencies since the spring of 2023 and primarily focused on increasing collaborative decision making, prioritizing conservation efforts, and clarifying existing management direction. The results of recent research have provided important tools that help to identify source populations and areas with high survival rates that are incorporated through these changes to better support GRSG persistence.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

In Nevada and Northeastern California, the BLM considered 16[10] areas for potential designation as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) for GRSG habitat. These areas were first identified through both external nominations and internal rangewide and state-specific review processes. Nominations were subsequently evaluated by BLM experts to determine if they met the ACEC relevance and importance criteria identified in 43 CFR 1610.7-2 (3)(i) and (ii). With input from cooperating agencies and the public, the BLM identified the following 16 areas as meeting the relevance and importance criteria and included them, in accordance with 43 CFR 1610.7-2 (g) under Alternative 3 and Alternative 6 in the Final EIS as potential ACECs:

ACEC considered		Acres
Nevada/California	Warm Springs	89,539 acres
	North Fork O'Neil	937,512 acres
	Grass-Kobeh Valley	852,979 acres
	South Fork Dixie Flats	122,395 acres
	Idaho Border	49,019 acres
	Hays Canyon	340,850 acres
	Vya-Massacre	239,677 acres
	Buffalo Skedaddle	182,213 acres
	Montana Mountain	314,370 acres
	Butte Long Valley	606,293 acres
	Eureka North and South	66,9005 acres
	Monitor Valley	173,507 acres
	Reese River	85,000 acres
	Utah Border	58,650 acres
	Owyhee East	487,122 acres
	Owyhee West	704,650 acres
Total		**5,912,781 acres**

[10] 85,510-acre Little Butte Long Valley area was additionally identified in the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS but was removed from consideration in the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS after further analysis. See Appendix 5 of the Final EIS for additional information.

In order to be designated as an ACEC, in addition to meeting the relevance and importance criteria, an area must also meet the special management attention criterion which is identified in 43 CFR 1610.7-2:

> ***(3) Special management attention.*** *The important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish or wildlife resources; natural systems or processes; or natural hazards potentially impacting life and safety require special management attention. "Special management attention" means management prescriptions that:*
>
> > ***(i)*** *Protect and prevent irreparable damage to the relevant and important values, or that protect life and safety from natural hazards; and*
> >
> > ***(ii)*** *Would not be prescribed if the relevant and important values were not present. In this context, "irreparable damage" means harm to a value, resource, system, or process that substantially diminishes the relevance or importance of that value, resource, system, or process in such a way that recovery of the value, resource, system, or process to the extent necessary to restore its prior relevance or importance is impossible.*

In this Approved RMP Amendment and Final EIS, in compliance with 43 CFR 1610.7-2, the BLM has evaluated the areas found to have relevance and importance and proposed them for ACEC designation in Alternatives 3 and 6. The BLM has also analyzed the effects of the management direction to these proposed ACEC areas under all of the alternatives, including the Proposed RMP Amendment which is identified in this decision as the Approved RMP Amendment. The effects analysis provides the information needed to determine if special management attention is needed to protect and prevent irreparable damage to the relevant and important values identified for the areas as required by 43 CFR 1610.7-2(3).

To determine whether special management attention through ACEC designation is appropriate for these areas, the BLM considered a range of management directions that included two alternatives (Alternatives 3 and 6) that would designate the areas as ACECs and establish associated management direction, and five alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 4, 5, and the Proposed RMP Amendment) that would not designate these areas as ACECs. In Alternatives 3 and 6, the BLM considered different management strategies for the ACECs under consideration, with Alternative 3 generally providing the highest level of restrictions on development and other land uses and Alternative 6 providing a high level of restrictions but allowing for slightly more opportunities for use (See FEIS Appendix 5, Table 5-2 for more detail). The BLM analyzed the potential effects to the relevant and important values of GRSG habitat under all these alternatives.

In the Proposed RMP Amendment, the BLM identified fourteen areas that required additional protection from highly probable resource threats, including the 89,539-acre Warm Springs, 937,512-acre North Fork O'Neil, 487,122-acre Owyhee East[11], 852,979-acre Grass-Kobeh Valley, 122,395-acre South Fork Dixie Flats, 49,019-acre Idaho Border, 340,850-acre Hays Canyon, 293,677-acre Vya-Massacre, and 182,213-acre Buffalo Skedaddle proposed ACEC areas in Nevada/California as PHMA with limited exceptions. The BLM identified these areas as PHMA with limited exception rather than designating areas as ACECs because limiting the number of exceptions from management decisions already in use for PHMA did not justify giving these areas a separate designation but rather recognized areas within PHMA that require additional protections from a high likelihood of development that would cause negative impacts to GRSG and its habitats in those areas. In addition, since the changes in management were consistent across the range, the BLM determined that these areas were less suited to an ACEC designation, which are generally tailored to different values and locations. As detailed in Appendix 5 of the Final EIS, the BLM determined that this management direction under the Proposed RMP Amendment (including PHMA, PHMA with limited

[11] As the two areas are adjacent, the Owyhee East potential ACEC area was incorporated into the North Fork O'Neil PHMA with limited exceptions area in the Proposed RMP Amendment.

exceptions, and state-specific HMAs) would protect and prevent irreparable damage to the relevant and important values of these potential ACECs.

The Approved RMP Amendment does not designate any ACECs, nor does it identify any areas as PHMA with limited exceptions. Following the Proposed RMP Amendment, several states informed the BLM that they found the identification and additional protections in the PHMA with limited exceptions to be unnecessary; potentially inconsistent with state and local plans, policies, or programs (including because those states thought there could be confusion as to whether there would be two or three habitat management area designations); and a primary reason the states could not support the Proposed RMP Amendment. In consideration of the states' concerns related to ACECs and the PHMA areas with limited exceptions, and to allow the BLM and the states to move forward together, the BLM has removed PHMA with limited exception areas and is not designating any ACECs. The BLM maintains that the approach set out in the Proposed RMP Amendment, including PHMA with limited exceptions, is consistent with both best available science and state and local plans, policies, and programs. Additionally, BLM stands by the science and process used to identify the PHMA with limited exception areas, which indicates that these areas are more likely to be negatively impacted by development, potentially reducing their value for GRSG. However, a coordinated management approach between the BLM and the states is paramount to achieving GRSG conservation across its range. As detailed above in the BLM's purpose and need (refer to **Purpose and Need**), consistent and effective rangewide conservation is one of BLM's primary purposes in undertaking this RMP Amendment process. Therefore, the Approved RMP Amendment neither designates the potential ACEC areas as ACECs nor identifies them as a PHMA area with limited exceptions.

Under the Approved RMP Amendment, all proposed ACEC areas (including the 314,370-acre Montana Mountain, 606,239-acre Butte Long Valley, 66,905-acre Eureka North and South, 173,507-acre Monitor Valley, 85,000-acre Reese River, 58,659-acre Utah Border, 704,650-acre Owyhee West, 89,539-acre Warm Springs, 937,512-acre North Fork O'Neil, 487,122-acre Owyhee East, 852,979-acre Grass-Kobeh Valley, 122,395-acre South Fork Dixie Flats, 49,019-acre Idaho Border, 340,850-acre Hays Canyon, 293,677-acre Vya-Massacre, and 182,213-acre Buffalo Skedaddle areas) will be managed mostly as PHMA, with smaller portions managed as GHMA and OHMA, and minor portions managed as non-habitat (See Appendix 5 of the FEIS for more information).

As mostly PHMA, these areas will be largely managed as exclusion with exceptions for utility-scale solar, utility scale-wind, and closed with exceptions to saleable minerals/material management and non-energy leasable mineral development, with exceptions, and as avoidance for major ROWs. Further, new fluid mineral leasing in these areas will be subject to NSO for fluid mineral development, with exceptions. In the portions managed as GHMA in the Approved RMP Amendment, these areas will be open to fluid minerals development, with minor stipulations (including CSU for lek buffers and seasonal limitations), and avoidance for both utility scale solar testing and development and utility scale wind testing and development. GHMA will be open to non-energy leasable minerals, with state-specific minimization measures, open to locatable minerals, unless otherwise withdrawn, and open to major and minor ROWs, with applicable minimization measures and compensatory mitigation. OHMA areas will also be open to both utility scale solar testing and development and utility scale wind testing and development. These protections from potential development will provide protection to the relevant and important values of the 16 proposed ACEC areas. If projects are approved under the exception criteria the project and its impacts would be carefully evaluated during project specific NEPA. Meeting the parameters of the exception criteria would provide protections at the site and landscape scales through avoidance, minimization, and mitigation.

Refer to Appendix 5 in the FEIS for the nomination and evaluation process, and the analysis of effects of ACECs.

Rationale Conclusion

Considered comprehensively, the HMA designations and the allocations and management decisions in the Approved RMP Amendment best meet the purpose and need for this planning effort by using updated science and cooperating agency, public feedback, and BLM implementation experience, to provide management direction that, when used in concert with existing GRSG management direction that is not being amended, will be applied where it will be the most effective for conserving GRSG habitat across the species range while being responsive to the habitat variability, threats, and public land uses in the Nevada and Northeastern California planning area.

Changes and Clarifications made between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD

The Approved RMP Amendment is largely based on the Proposed RMP Amendment in the Greater Sage-grouse Rangewide Planning Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS that was published on November 15, 2024. There have been some changes and clarifications made as a result of coordination during the Governor's Consistency Review process and to improve alignment of state and federal legal authorities, policies, and programs. These changes are described below in the "Changes Between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD."

Consistent with 43 CFR 1610.2(f)(5) and 1610.5-1(b), significant changes to the proposed management direction published in the Proposed RMP Amendment were published for public comment on September 2, 2025, for a 30-day comment period. The BLM carefully reviewed each of the changes to determine if they would result in significant effects outside the range of effects analyzed in the Proposed RMPA/Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The BLM has determined that the analysis described in the Proposed RMPA/Final EIS is inclusive of the effects that would occur because of these changed management actions and supplemental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act is not needed. A summary of the substantive comments received on the proposed changes and the BLM's response can be found in **Appendix 10**, Summary of Public Comments on the Proposed Changes Between Proposed RMPA and ROD.

In addition to the significant changes described below, the BLM also made clarifications and minor edits to the text of the Approved RMP Amendment. These clarifications are described below in the "Changes and clarifications between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD" section. These clarifications and the edits made are neither substantive nor significant and therefore do not require that the BLM provide the public with further opportunity to comment.

Significant Changes between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD

These changes were made to the Proposed RMP Amendment during the Governor's Consistency Review process. Section 202 of FLPMA and its implementing regulations require the BLM to develop, amend, and revise land use plans to be consistent with State and local plans to the maximum extent consistent with federal law and the purposes of FLPMA. This planning effort involved extensive coordination and consultation with State representatives, including modifying the RMPA to improve consistency with the State plans and regulations.

These changes were within the range of alternatives considered in the Final EIS, and the BLM determined were substantially significant to warrant a public notice and comment period consistent with the BLM's planning regulations at 43 CFR 1610.5-1(b). As a result, the BLM published a notice in the Federal Register on September 3, 2025, notifying the public of these changes and providing a 30-day comment period. The results of the comment period are described in the Public Involvement section below.

PHMA with Limited Exceptions:

The BLM is not including the identification of PHMA with limited exceptions and the associated PHMA with limited exceptions management direction that was identified in the Proposed RMP Amendment in the Approved RMP Amendment. As described in the ACEC section above, several states found the identification of PHMA with limited exceptions and the additional protections provided for these areas to be unnecessary; potentially inconsistent with state and local plans, policies, or programs; and a primary reason the states could not support the Proposed RMP Amendment.

Grass Height Benchmark:

In response to concerns raised by the Governor of Nevada's consistency review, BLM Nevada and California changed the benchmark for residual grass height from a specific height to "[S]uitable nesting cover" and acknowledged that the habitat benchmarks and indicators associated with the suitable habitat objective would be updated with evolving science.

Adaptive Management:

The adaptive management language was changed from the Proposed RMPAs for Idaho, Montana/Dakotas, Nevada/California, Utah, and Wyoming to improve consistent rangewide adaptive management. The BLM has closely coordinated with the Western Governors Association Sage-grouse Conservation Task Force (Task Force) to better align the BLM's adaptive management process with state policies and programs to manage GRSG populations. States expressed a need to clarify how state adaptive management approaches would be incorporated into the BLM's adaptive management process, and several states expressed concern with using the targeted annual warning system (TAWS) model and a desire to use models maintained and controlled by state wildlife agencies for sage-grouse population calculations. The BLM worked closely with the Task Force to develop an adaptive management approach that recognizes state governments' authority to manage GRSG populations while remaining consistent with the BLM's adaptive management process in the Oregon and Colorado Approved RMP Amendments. The revised Adaptive Management language is included in Table 1 of the Approved RMP Amendment and Appendix 9. In response to public comments, the adaptive management appendix was updated to clarify that activation of habitat thresholds will be verified through the existing CFA process, that routine maintenance and operations of electric utilities is considered an exception to threshold responses, and that grazing permits may be renewed for the duration of the CFA while a CFA is ongoing.

Changes and clarifications between Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and Approved RMP Amendment/ROD

PHMA Allocations and Management Direction (Approved RMP Amendment Table 1):

- ***Edits to the GRSG Goal:*** Replaced "Conserve, enhance, restore" with language directly from FLPMA, removed the reference to BLM manual 6500, and integrated the connectivity concept into a comma-list rather than a stand-alone sentence. These edits retain the desired condition sought in the original goal (habitat that supports connected, persistent and healthy populations), and improve

alignment with FLPMA's statutory language. The comma list of "conserve, enhance, restore" are all versions of management; splitting them out does not clarify the agency's desired condition. These edits focus on the agency's desired outcome, regardless of the most applicable managerial tool. Finally, as a special status species, GRSG are associated with the BLM's 6840 manual, and not the 6500 wildlife and fisheries manual. Since these edits retain the original desired condition, the changes are not significant.

- **Fluid Minerals Objective:** Changed "…avoid, minimize, and compensate for adverse impacts to GRSG habitat to the extent practical under the law…" to read "…avoid when practicable, then minimize and compensate for adverse impacts to GRSG habitat to the extent required under the law…" The change clarifies that complete avoidance (i.e., closure to leasing) was not the intent of this objective. The change clarifies that avoidance is an important tool, but it is just one of the tools to mitigate impacts to GRSG from fluid mineral development. The change of "practical" to "required" more accurately connects the mitigation tools in this objective to actual statutory requirements instead of just practicality. In addition, the italicized text that was included in the Final EIS was removed, as it was merely for the reader comprehension when comparing alternatives, which is no longer an issue in the Approved RMP Amendment.
- **Fluid Minerals Management Direction:** Renamed the Allocation section to read "Allocations for Unleased Lands" and moved it to directly precede the language for exceptions, modifications and waivers to more clearly associated the WEMs with the allocations/stipulations. In addition, moved the paragraphs associated with coordination with state agencies, application of WEMs in areas where adaptive management thresholds are activated, and with applicable public review direction to be presented just once, under the "Allocations for Unleased Lands" header rather than repeating them under each applicable WEM. Also moved the Exception 1 paragraph related to land ownership patterns to be a stand-alone Exception 3, as it is unrelated to the other purposes noted in the rest of Exception 1. These and other editorial changes were made to decrease repetition and improve readability.

  Revised the first sentence of the second paragraph by removing the example and focusing on the outcomes being sought. Deleted the second sentence of the second paragraph as it merely provided some approaches that could be taken to achieve the outcomes from the first sentence ("to promote effective management and connectivity of seasonal habitats and PHMA to accomplish measurable GRSG conservation objectives"). The last sentence of the second paragraph was edited to improve clarity of intent, as the original wording was unclear. These edits relate to improving clarity or removing examples, and the underlying condition being sought has not changed, therefore these edits are not significant.
- **Fluid Minerals Allocations for Unleased Lands/Waivers, Exceptions, Modifications:** The BLM added "controlled surface use (CSU), and Timing Limitations (TL)" to the end of the fluid mineral allocation to better specify the conditions that fluid mineral development is subject to within PHMA. These conditions are not new and were previously described elsewhere in the Proposed RMP Amendment. The full allocation now reads "Open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy (NSO) (unless otherwise closed), controlled surface use (CSU), and Timing Limitations (TL). Refer to the following NSO exceptions."

  The text explicitly identifying a 30-day public review period prior to granting the NSO or disturbance cap waiver, exception and modification was revised. The new text states that "prior to granting a waiver, exception, or modification to any GRSG NSO stipulation or Disturbance Cap, the Authorized Officer shall comply with regulatory public review requirements, if applicable (see 43

CFR 3101)." This change is not significant because the BLM's fluid mineral regulations in the cited section already requires Authorized Officers to provide at least a 30-day public review opportunity prior to granting exceptions (i.e., one-time waivers) and modifications for changes that involve "an issue of major concern to the public" or "…a change to a lease term or stipulation that is substantial…" Because this direction is already in regulation, there is no need to repeat it in the RMP, and its removal from the RMP results in no change to agency practice, therefore this change is not significant.

The text at the end of the first sentences in NSO Exceptions 1 and 2 that states "after documenting the review of available information associated with the site proposed for the exception" and "both internally compiled and as provided by state, county, and other local agencies, tribal governments, project proponents, other federal agencies or interested stakeholders" was deleted. This change was made to remove implementation process language that is not appropriate for inclusion in RMPs. The parties from which the BLM accepts information is guided by statute, regulation, and policy. Because the removed language is process (how something will be done, not what will be done), its removal is not significant as the standard that must be met to grant either exception remains.

The last sentence in the second criteria under the GRSG NSO Exception 2 was edited to remove an inconsistency between the exception text and the fluid minerals objective and allocation WEMs. The sentence originally noted that the exception could be granted if it was demonstrated that "the project cannot be avoided or minimized" and that "granting the mitigated exception would not result in adverse effects to GRSG seasonal habitats." The BLM retains discretion to deny any and every exception, and therefore could always "avoid" the effects of a project. Following this thought process, the exception could never be granted, which is inconsistent with having the exception and the fluid mineral leasing objective of applying the full range of mitigation options. The language was revised to shift the focus for considering the exception to the standard that the mitigated exception, after applying avoidance, minimization, and voluntary compensatory mitigation, "would not result in adverse effects to GRSG seasonal habitats." Because the final condition of the two versions is the same, this change is not significant.

- **Non-energy Leasable Minerals:** "Apply required design features, best management practices, and minimization measures identified in the existing GRSG amendments (refer to **Appendix 2**)" was added as Management Direction. This direction was previously included in GHMA only and was inadvertently omitted from inclusion in PHMA in the Proposed RMP Amendment. BLM added this direction to clarify that these measures apply for non-energy leasable minerals projects in both PHMA and GHMA.
- **Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials: Added "**unless it meets one of the allocation exception criteria outlined in **MD SSS 5"** to clarify that exceptions to the closed allocation are subject to exceptions provided by **MD SSS 5.**
- **Major ROWS:** BLM revised the language of the first major ROW avoidance criteria to better articulate the provision described in MD LR 2 (see **Appendix 2**), which facilitates actions in RMP designated corridors for which they were established. The sentence now reads "RMP designated corridors within PHMA are open to consideration of a new major ROW in the category of ROW for which the corridor was designated if the proposed authorization results in impacts similar to those already described in the environmental analysis to establish the corridor, including indirect disturbance to or disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats."

  The second avoidance criteria for major ROWs initially read "the ROW can be routed through, or located within non-habitat or unsuitable habitat and lacks the ecological potential to become suitable

habitat…" The language related to unsuitable habitat was removed to align with the exception language in the fluid mineral WEMs section. This change is not significant, as unsuitable habitat that ecologically cannot become suitable would not be habitat, which is already included in the category of non-habitat. In addition, the text of the second bullet also reads "ROWs shall not disrupt connectivity between habitat areas…" This was edited to read "ROWs shall minimize disruption of connectivity…" Completely eliminating any impact to connectivity movements can only be accomplished through not allowing any development. If that was the agency's intent, the area would have been allocated as ROW exclusion. Since the intent of this action is to allow for consideration of development under narrow conditions, the text was changed to improve consistency with intent, while retaining the need to protect connectivity between populations. Finally, the second sentence of the exception language in sub-bullet "a" was moved to be a stand-alone sub-bullet "b" and was reworded to improve clarity of intent.

- **Livestock Grazing:** The BLM removed the second and third sentences in the second paragraph in Allocation RM-1. These sentences present a comma list of potential adjustments the BLM considers "in conformance with [BLM's grazing] regulations." The last sentence of Allocation RM-1 was then merged at the end of the retained sentence. The last sentence refers the reader to Appendix 5, which includes grazing best management practices, many of which include items from the deleted coma list. The deletion of these sentences is not significant due to the lack of RMP-decision, repetition of regulation and policy, and duplication in Appendix 5.

  BLM revised the language in the third sentence of management direction RM-2 to better articulate the management direction's consistency with BLM regulations and policy. The sentence now reads "Thresholds specific to GRSG habitat will be developed to make significant progress toward fulfillment of the Land Health Standards (43 CFR Part 4180.2 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy) and maintain or move PHMA toward providing suitable GRSG habitat (e.g., Table 4-1, **Appendix 4**) where livestock grazing has been identified as a significant causal factor, and be designed to address the HAF assessment rating that warranted the Land Health Evaluation finding, and consider ecological site potential, and relevant locally specific conditions, and Land Health Standards."

  In addition, the sentence in RM-4 to "focus authorization…on projects that have a nominal or incidental effects" was removed due to the use of the unclear terms of focus, nominal and incidental. Based on experience implementing the 2015 ARMPAs, the use of these undefined and ambiguous terms results in confusion and inconsistency during implementation. The removal of this sentence is not significant, as the overall intent of RM-4 is retained in the absence of this sentence, specifically that "new…improvements should be placed along existing disturbance corridors in the least suitable habitat…"

  Finally, the management direction RM-6 was removed from the Approved RMP Amendment. It was removed to simplify the RMP amendment by removing range management actions that merely re-state the BLM's existing authorities. This change is not significant because nothing in RM-6 compels or requires the BLM to select a specific course of action if relinquishment occurs, only to consider a course of action, which is a re-statement of BLM's authorities under existing grazing regulations. The BLM will continue to follow applicable law, regulations, and policy when implementing grazing decisions on public lands.

  The introduction of Appendix 5 was edited to clarify that the livestock grazing strategies, practices, or design features are presented as tools but are not required to be considered and dismissed for every action, as the required design features were from the 2015 ARMPA. In addition, the BMPs

were edited to eliminate duplication of concepts and clarify implementation in coordination of livestock grazing practices with non-BLM agencies and landowners. This is most evident in the deletion of section 5.1.5 that summarized principles from the BLM's 2004 National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy. That section's concepts are included in management actions in the Approved RMP Amendment and bullets in Appendix 5.

- **Predation:** The first sentence of Management Action 2 was adjusted from, "authorizations that require expanded, or new, or renewal of energy or transmission related infrastructure…" to "authorizations that require expanded, new, renewal, or non-routine maintenance of energy, mining, or transmission related infrastructure projects…" to better explain which projects require proponents to submit a predator subsidy management plan. A definition of "non-routine maintenance" was also added to **Appendix 6**, Glossary.
- **Mitigation:** The mitigation language from the Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS was updated to reflect the mitigation language from Alternative 2 (2019 ARMPA) in the Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS. Adjustments to the 2019 ARMPA text were made to remove references to and text associated with rescinded CEQ NEPA regulations and BLM policies. Recission of the 2024 version (6-142) of BLM Manual 6840 and reversion to the 2008 version (Rel – 6-125) changes the agency policy for compensatory mitigation related to special status species. Specifically, the 2024 version notes the land use plan should "…seek to achieve no net loss or net benefit outcomes for special status species…" No such language is in the 2008 version. The 2024 version also directs the BLM to "develop and implement compensatory mitigation…" In the 2008 version, the manual states management should be developed to "minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of the species or to improve the condition of the species habitat." There is only one sentence of the last option (of eight) to achieve this for BLM special status species that states "off-site mitigation may be used to reduce potential effects on Bureau listed species." The change to the Approved RMP Amendment mitigation language is made to better align with the current special status species policies within the range of alternatives available. Because the intent of this plan amendment has consistently been to seek to avoid and minimize impacts first, with compensatory mitigation being a tertiary tool, the BLM's clarification about how it will approach compensatory mitigation is not a significant change. Moreover, the BLM will continue to rely on the primary protective measures of fluid mineral NSO and a broader disturbance protocol/cap, requiring exceptions being met, including voluntary compensatory mitigation, before granting exceptions. For these reasons, changing the compensatory mitigation language is not a significant change.
- **Disturbance Protocol/Cap:** Added "anthropogenic" as a modifier to the management direction related to "direct habitat disturbance" to further clarify that the disturbance being considered in the protocol/cap is that associated with anthropogenic infrastructure developments. In addition, clarified the Disturbance Protocol/Cap Denominator section in the fourth paragraph related to non-habitat and unsuitable habitat by replacing the word "otherwise" at the end of the first sentence with "areas of non-habitat or unsuitable habitat" and adding examples of processes and data to identify non-habitat and unsuitable habitat in the second sentence. These edits simply clarify otherwise less clear language. Finally, in the list of conditions associated with granting an exception to the disturbance cap, sub-bullets "c" and "e" in Nevada and "d" and "f" in California were combined, as they addressed similar conditions.

  In the disturbance protocol/cap numerator section, the bullet for "military range facilities and infrastructure" was removed. Since implementing the 2015 disturbance cap, no areas in this category have been documented in PHMA. In addition, there are no acres of Department of War lands

overlapping PHMA in Utah, Nevada, North Dakota, Montana, or Wyoming. As such, there is no potential for these types of disturbances. In Idaho and South Dakota, a small fraction of the total HMA acres where the disturbance cap applies are Department of War lands (12 acres in Idaho PHMA, 204 acres of South Dakota PHMA, and 11,143 acres of Idaho IHMA). In addition, if any infrastructure was constructed on these lands, it would be a fraction of the total acres. Given current and likely future potential for these types of disturbances, removing this bullet is not significant.

In addition, clarifying language was added to the Disturbance Management Protocol section to acknowledge that it is in alignment with the State's GRSG Plan and the 2015 and 2019 Approved RMP Amendments. The State of California would follow the rangewide disturbance cap.

- **Utility Scale Solar and Wind:** The allocation for both utility scale wind and solar development remains unchanged as exclusion; the exception criteria for the exclusion allocation were removed for both wind and solar. Given the nature of the updated GRSG habitat management areas and the amount of land needed for utility scale wind and solar projects, including exceptions to the exclusion allocation is misleading. While there are areas of non-habitat and unsuitable habitat, they are generally small, non-contiguous patches. Combined with the known impacts of large solar and wind projects, and especially the indirect impacts of wind development on adjacent lands, there is very little likelihood that any areas could meet the exceptions. Therefore, removing these exceptions is not a significant change considering potential impacts to both GRSG and wind and solar development.

  In the instance of smaller solar projects developed as ancillary support for other approved uses (e.g., mineral development, data centers), narrow exceptions consistent with the fluid mineral NSO exceptions were retained. Such developments can be used to electrify remote mineral developments and can be used in place of constructing powerlines. Any such developments, if proposed, would have similar impacts to those associated with fluid minerals development, so this change is not significant.
- **References to a "qualified biologist":** Fluid mineral NSO exceptions 1 and 2 and major ROWs avoidance criteria refer to conditions being determined by a "qualified biologist" with no definition or education and experience standards for such. Rather than using this undefined term, it was changed to read "wildlife biologist" with the understanding that an individual with education and qualifications in wildlife biology will understand the scientific principles needed to perform the needed tasks.
- **References to specific positions for certain tasks:** Several management actions identified specific BLM positions to complete certain tasks. While all these required actions were retained, task assignments to a specific position were removed. The RMP is not the correct document to establish a delegated authority for specific tasks to specific positions. Beyond authorities specifically described in regulations – generally the "Authorized Officer" or "State Director" – the BLM will comply with agency defined delegations of authority when implementing the RMP. Since the various actions were all retained, there is no effect of removing the BLM position that implements an action.

GHMA Allocations and Management Direction (Approved RMP Amendment Table 2):

- **Fluid Minerals:** The language from the Proposed RMP Amendment "**Allocation and Management Actions:** Same management direction as identified in 2015 and 2019 for all States except as noted in "State-Specific Differences" column was updated to read "**Objectives, Allocation, and Management Direction**: Same as identified in 2015 RMP Amendment." This

adjustment was made to reflect BLM's intent that fluid mineral objectives, allocations, and management direction are not amended in GHMA in this Approved RMP Amendment.

- **Major Right of Way:** The Proposed RMP identified that GHMA would have the same management direction as PHMA for BLM-NV. The Approved RMP Amendment aligned BLM-NV with BLM-CA[12] and the rangewide direction. The allocation now reads, "Open with applicable state minimization measures from 2015 and 2019 GRSG amendments, and compensatory mitigation, to maintain habitat supporting GRSG populations consistent with state agency habitat designations (e.g., restoration, connectivity, seasonal, or other), and to preclude negative impacts to PHMA habitats."
- **Livestock Grazing:** BLM corrected a typo in the number of management direction referenced in livestock grazing management direction, revising "Same as PHMA except RM-3 does not apply" to "Same as PHMA except RM-2 does not apply."

Other: Across the RMP Amendment, BLM made several revisions in developing the Nevada and California-specific Approved RMP Amendment from the rangewide Proposed RMP Amendment. Clarifications were also made to improve clarity. These clarifications include:

- Additional detail when referencing previous GRSG-related RMP Amendments.
- In developing the Nevada and California-specific Approved RMP Amendment, BLM adopted the vector or polygon version of the HMA map included in the Proposed RMP Amendment, which was represented by a raster version. This was done in coordination and alignment with the State of Nevada. This change reduced pixelation within the map and provided polygons to identify management areas. Identifying the HMA map would be updated when updated models are produced.
- Appendices were renumbered and small editorial changes were made to introductory text.
- Additional language was added to MD LR 2 to clarify that future designated corridors approved through separate NEPA actions will be managed consistently with designated corridors that are identified in this plan.
- Language that states BLM Nevada and California will develop an implementation-level Memorandum of Understanding with the State of Nevada to identify roles and responsibilities and address any potential inconsistencies between the State of Nevada's adaptive management plan and the BLM's adaptive management framework.
- Adding additional details regarding implementation of the DMP and locatable minerals. Specifically, the following language was added: "Although locatable mine sites are included in the degradation calculation, mining activities under the 1872 mining law may not be subject to the DMP. Details about locatable mining activities will be fully disclosed and analyzed in the NEPA process to assess impacts to sage-grouse and their habitat as well as to BLM goals and objectives, and other BLM programs and activities."
- Nevada and California state-specific modifications to rangewide text, previously described separately in the Proposed RMP Amendment, were integrated directly into the language in the Approved RMP Amendment. This includes direct edits to the text of objectives, allocations, and management direction, as well as additions of Nevada and California-specific HMA direction. Additionally:
  - **Coal:** Management direction for coal resources was removed, as the BLM does not manage coal resources in Nevada or Northeastern California.

[12] The BLM California State Director administers approximately 1.1 million acres in northwestern Nevada and is the Authorized Officer on these lands.

- **Glossary:** Nevada and California-specific definitions were added into the glossary, adding additional detail to BLM's adoption of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA)'s lek definitions.

MITIGATION

The BLM has adopted all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm in the Approved RMP Amendment. In determining the scope of the planning effort, BLM identified habitat mitigation as an element of RMPs considered for amendment to meet the purpose and need of responding to updated scientific information and changing land uses and providing for consistent and effective rangewide conservation based on biological information that is responsive to locally relevant habitat variability. The BLM focused on habitat mitigation as sagebrush habitat fragmentation, loss and disturbance have been identified as the primary influences on GRSG population trends (Knick and Hanser, 2011). Therefore, as mitigation was within the scope of the RMP Amendment, the BLM considered a range of alternatives for mitigation strategies to best address the purpose and need and analyzed potential impacts of each alternative in the EIS (See FEIS Appendix 21 for more detail).

As described above, the BLM determined the management direction identified in the Proposed RMP Amendment, with the changes as described, in combination with the mitigation approach from Alternative 2, best meets the purpose and need and has decided to select it in this Approved RMP Amendment. The Approved RMP Amendment thus establishes the habitat objectives and management actions below and provides additional detail on the application of mitigation during project implementation (see Table 1 in the Approve RMP Amendment).

Consistent with the FLPMA, as amended, the BLM's Resource Management Planning Regulations at 43 CFR 1610, and BLM policy in the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), all resource management authorizations and actions, and subsequent more detailed or specific planning must conform to the approved RMP. Therefore, by establishing this enforceable RMP direction, the BLM has adopted all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm.

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Tribal Government Consultation

BLM sought to initiate Tribal consultation efforts in the preparation of this RMP Amendment and coordinated with all appropriate recognized Tribes on the planning effort in accordance with BLM Manual 8130 (BLM 2004) and Handbook 1780 (BLM 2016a). The BLM contacted the Tribes by mail, email, and/or phone at multiple stages in the planning process (direct outreach, official Scoping period, Draft RMP Amendment and Draft EIS comment period, and during administrative review periods). Subsequent outreach continued through emails, phone calls, and meetings with Tribal personnel, as they have expressed interest. The BLM provided requested clarification or information and held a formal government-to-government consultation.

Formal, government-to-government consultation occurred with the following Tribes: Alturas Rancheria, Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Burns Paiute Tribe, Cedarville Rancheria, Duckwater Shoshone Tribe, Ely Shoshone Tribe, Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Fort Bidwell Indian Community, Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of Nevada and Oregon, Klamath Tribes, Lovelock Paiute Tribe of the Lovelock Indian Colony, Modoc Nation, Pit River Tribe, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, Susanville Indian Rancheria, Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians, Battle Mountain Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians, Elko Band of

the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians, South Fork Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians, Wells Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians, Timbisha Shoshone Tribe, Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe, Walker River Paiute Tribe, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, Winnemucca Indian Colony of Nevada, Yerington Paiute Tribe, and the Yomba Shoshone Tribe.

On September 4, 2024, the BLM held an online information session for Tribal governments to provide an update on the development of the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS. Individuals from the Ely Shoshone Tribe, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Moapa Band of Paiutes, and the Modoc Nation attended the informational meeting.

State Historic Preservation Office Coordination

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and regulations at 36 CFR Part 800 govern the BLM's cultural resource management programs. These regulations provide specific procedures for consultation between the BLM and State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO). The California BLM coordinated with the California and the Nevada SHPOs in accordance with stipulations 8.1.I and 8.2.A of the 2014 State Protocol Agreement among the California BLM, the California State Historic Preservation Officer and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer on this plan amendment effort and in accordance with the National Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the BLM, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

The Approved RMP Amendment will not approve any site-specific actions on BLM-administered lands within the planning area. The BLM will satisfy the requirements of NHPA Section 106 for future implementation-level decisions, such as project proposals, including adequate consultation with SHPOs, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), Native American Tribes, and other interested parties, consistent with the alternative procedures set forth in the National PA and relevant state protocols or where applicable the Section 106 regulations.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation

Under Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, federal agencies must consult with USFWS when an action the agency carries out, funds, or authorizes a project that may affect a federally listed or endangered species or its critical habitat. The Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS describes potential impacts on threatened and endangered species because of management actions proposed in the alternatives. The USFWS is a cooperating agency in this planning process. The BLM has met with the USFWS and provided them with drafts of proposed management direction for discussion and input.

The BLM initiated Section 7 consultation with the USFWS on August 14, 2023, before the release of the Draft RMP Amendment/Draft EIS and requested concurrence on which species would require consideration during consultation. Over the ensuing months, regular meetings were held to identify the species that would be analyzed in the biological assessment, to address which actions could affect those species, and to determine whether the implementation of the Proposed RMP Amendment "may affect" the species for which this consultation occurred.

The BLM submitted the biological assessment to the USFWS on November 19, 2024, with an amendment submitted on December 6, 2024 for review on whether the plans would affect a federally listed, proposed, or candidate species. The USFWS evaluated the biological assessment and concurred with either a "no effect" or "may effect" or "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" determination via memorandum for all states within the planning area. Based on revisions to BLM's RMP Amendment, summarized in the **Changes and Clarifications** section above, the USFWS provided a revised concurrence memorandum

on January 8, 2025. On September 10, 2025, BLM provided an updated memo and Biological Assessment for the GRSG Rangewide Planning effort and the Proposed Changes document. On October 22, 2025, USFWS provided a concurrence letter concluding informal consultation on BLM's Greater Sage-grouse Rangewide Planning Changes to Proposed RMPA for Idaho, Montana/Dakotas, Nevada/California, Utah, and Wyoming document. On December 8, 2025, the USFWS reviewed the changes made in response to public comments and DOI review and stated that they did not need to re-issue a concurrence memorandum. This memorandum is included as Appendix 8 in this Approved RMP Amendment.

Cooperating Agencies

In December 2021 and January 2022, the BLM invited Tribal governments and state and local agencies with jurisdiction by either law or special expertise, or both, to participate as cooperating agencies in the planning process. A cooperating agency can be a Tribe, federal, state, or local government agency with jurisdiction by law or special expertise that assists a lead federal agency in developing an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement (40 CFR 1508.5). The BLM invited many cooperators to engage in this effort who either did not reply or chose not to participate.

Coordination with the cooperating agencies has included project presentations and working meetings discussing the purpose and need, new science, alternative strategies, range of alternatives, review of alternative text, meetings to review subsequent changes and further refine the alternatives, and a review of the administrative Draft RMP Amendment/EIS. Since the release of the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS, the BLM has met with cooperating agencies to discuss their feedback on the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS and get their input on the development of the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS and state-specific management direction. Cooperating agencies were provided an administrative draft of the Proposed RMP Amendment management direction for review. As a result of these reviews and the many state-level meetings with cooperating agencies, the BLM made many changes to the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS that improved the clarity of the document and addressed cooperating agency concerns.

Details on the full process followed for cooperating agency invitation, engagement and participation can be found in the Final EIS in Chapter 5, Section 5.4 Cooperating Agencies.

Federal cooperating agencies included the United States Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for Nevada and California BLM. Cooperating agencies include Nevada Department of Wildlife, Nevada Department of Agriculture, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Nevada Division of Minerals, Churchill County, Elko County, Eureka County, Humboldt County, Lincoln County, Mineral County, Nye County, Pershing County, White Pine County. BLM Nevada established a standing 2-hour, bi-weekly meeting for collaborative development of the RMP Amendment. Additionally, the California BLM met with CDFW although they were not a cooperating agency.

Governor's Consistency Review

The BLM's planning regulations require that BLM RMPs and RMP Amendments be "consistent with officially approved or adopted resource-related plans, and the policies and procedures contained therein, of other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and Indian Tribes, so long as the guidance and resource management plans also are consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of Federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands" (43 CFR 1610.3-2(a)).

The BLM made the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS available to the Governors of Nevada and California for a 60-day consistency review as required by 43 CFR 1610.3-2(e). The Governor's consistency review of the Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS ran from November 8, 2024 through January 7, 2025. The

Governor of Nevada submitted a letter to the BLM that raised concerns and potential inconsistencies between the Proposed RMP Amendment and state policies. The Governor of California did not respond. The BLM met with the Nevada's Governor's Office three times to discuss their concerns prior to the NV BLM Sate Director issuing a response letter on July 30, 2025. As a result of these meetings, the BLM provided clarifying language to the RMP Amendment as described in the **Clarifications** section of this ROD. In addition, BLM made significant changes to address these concerns that were provided to the public for a 30-day review. The BLM and the Nevada Governor's Office also committed to an ongoing dialogue on issues of interest to the State of Nevada. The Nevada Governors' Office expressed support for the BLM to move forward with issuance of the RMP Amendment and ROD and did not appeal the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS to the BLM Director.

RMP Amendment Monitoring

RMP monitoring is the process of tracking the implementation of resource management plan decisions (implementation monitoring) and collecting data/information necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of land use plan decisions (effectiveness monitoring) in meeting the purpose and need of the plan or plan amendment. Monitoring strategies for GRSG habitat and populations must be collaborative, as habitat occurs across jurisdictional boundaries. As part of the 2015 GRSG amendment effort, the BLM developed a Monitoring Framework to provide consistent approaches to monitor planning actions across the range (BLM 2015a). In 2021, the BLM published the *Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Implementation Rangewide Monitoring Report for 2015-2020* with the results of implementing the 2015 monitoring framework. As part of this amendment process, the BLM is revisiting the approaches in the monitoring framework, updating it based on lessons learned over the past eight years. The updated monitoring framework is in **Appendix 3**. The BLM's monitoring efforts will continue in partnership with federal and state fish and wildlife agencies.

Monitoring data is used to draw conclusions on whether management actions are being implemented, and if they are helping to meet the stated objectives. Conclusions are then developed to recommend whether to continue current management or to identify any changes that may need to be made to meet objectives. The BLM would use land use plan evaluations to determine if the decisions in the RMP Amendment, supported by the accompanying NEPA analysis, may need to be amended in light of new information and monitoring data. Its evaluations would follow the protocols established by the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), Inventory and Monitoring of Ecological Resources Manual (MS-1735), and other appropriate guidance in effect at the time the evaluation is initiated.

Public Involvement

In addition to the extensive collaboration with federal, state, local, and Tribal governments and cooperating agencies detailed above, the BLM provided numerous opportunities for public involvement throughout the development of the RMP Amendment and EIS. The Approved RMP Amendment and Final EIS were substantially shaped based on input provided by the public.

Project Website

The BLM maintains a national GRSG conservation website (https://www.blm.gov/programs/fish-and-wildlife/sage-grouse) as part of its efforts to maintain and restore GRSG habitat on public lands. The site is intended to help the public learn how the BLM is working to maintain and restore GRSG habitat. It includes background information related to government and BLM roles in GRSG conservation. In addition to the national GRSG conservation website, the BLM established a National NEPA Register website with information related to this planning effort at https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/2016719/510. Throughout the planning process, the BLM maintained both websites to include the most current

information, and share background documents, information on public meetings, contact information, and all relevant planning and NEPA-related documents.

Scoping Process

The formal public scoping process for the RMP Amendment/EIS began on November 22, 2021, with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to amend RMPs and prepare an EIS in the *Federal Register* (Vol. 86 No. 222). The NOI notified the public of BLM's intent to develop an RMP Amendment for the management of GRSG and initiated the public scoping period, which closed on February 8, 2022. In January 2022, BLM hosted two virtual public meetings, during which BLM provided opportunities to become involved, learn about the project and the planning process, and participate in a question-and-answer session where participants were able to ask BLM specialists questions and receive live responses. During the comment period, the BLM received 258 total submissions containing 1,865 unique comments. The issues identified during public scoping and outreach helped inform the development of the alternatives and the resource issues analyzed in the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS.

Draft RMP Amendment/EIS Comment Period

The BLM released the Draft RMP Amendment/EIS for a 90-day comment period from March 15th, 2024, through June 13th, 2024. Thirteen public meetings were held, including two virtual meetings and eleven in-person meetings throughout the planning area. Over 39,000 submissions were received, including approximately 6,000 individual comments. The BLM has also initiated and/or participated in over 80 meetings with Tribes; federal, state, and county cooperating agencies; and interest groups between the issuance of the Draft RMP Amendment /EIS and Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS. The BLM considered all public comments and responded to all substantive comments in the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final EIS (refer to Appendix 22, Draft RMP Amendment/EIS Public Outreach and Responses to Substantive Public Comments in the Final EIS). The high level of public comments and stakeholder coordination significantly shaped the RMP Amendment.

Final EIS Availability Period and Proposed RMP Amendment Protest Period

The BLM released the Proposed RMP Amendment and Final EIS on November 8, 2024, and published an associated Federal Register Notice (89 FR 90311) on November 15, 2024. The Final EIS was also identified in the Environmental Protection Agency's EIS Availability Federal Register Notice on November 15, 2024 (89 FR 90280).

The public was invited to submit protests on the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The protest period was 30 days, from November 15 to December 16, 2024. The BLM received 60 unique protest letters.

The planning regulations at 43 CFR 1610.5-2 outline the requirements for filing a valid protest. Resolution of protests is delegated to the BLM Assistant Director for Resources and Planning whose decision on the protest is the final decision of the U.S. Department of the Interior (43 CFR 1610.5-2(b)) consistent with the BLM Delegation of Authority Manual (MS-1203 Delegation of Authority). The BLM evaluated all protest letters to determine which protest letters were complete and timely, and which persons have standing to protest. Four letters were complete and timely but were dismissed because the people who submitted the letters did not have standing to protest. The remaining 56 letters were complete and timely and were from parties who had standing to protest. Of these, 50 letters contained valid protest issues.

After careful review of the report by the BLM's Assistant Director for Resources and Planning, the Assistant Director concluded that the BLM followed the applicable laws, regulations, and policies and considered all

relevant resource information and public input. The Assistant Director addressed the protests and issued the BLM Director's Protest Resolution Report: Greater Sage-Grouse Rangewide Planning Proposed RMP Amendment and Final Environmental Impact Statement on the BLM's website[13]. All valid protest issues were denied; no changes to the GRSG Proposed RMP Amendment/FEIS were necessary.

ONGOING ACTIONS

The BLM has numerous ongoing reviews of proposed projects, ranging from proposals for which the BLM has just received an application to those where the BLM is nearing a decision. The extent to which this Approved RMP Amendment will apply to these ongoing projects will depend on the stage of the project in the NEPA review and decision-making process. To maintain the orderly administration and management of the public lands, the BLM will be consistent with this Approved RMP Amendment unless the BLM has an EIS or Environmental Assessment that is substantially underway for a project before the publication of this Approved RMP Amendment. The decision for such projects and any subsequent authorizations associated with the approval (such as the issuance of a ROW authorized by a decision) will be exempted from the requirements of this effort's approved GRSG planning decision. The BLM has the discretion to apply the Approved RMP Amendment to these exempted projects and will seek input from the project proponent prior to exercising such discretion.

In addition, the following project will not be subject to the decisions made in the Approved RMP Amendment:

- Dodge Flat II Solar Project EA/RMP Amendment (DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2024-0001-RMP-EA)
- Foreland Refining LLC Eagle Springs direct land sale EA/RMP Amendment
- Lazy 5 Transmission Line EA (DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2025-0032-EA)
- Silicon Plan of Operations Amendment EA (AngloGold Ashanti)
- North Bullfrog Mine Project (DOI-BLM-NV-B020-2024-0019-EIS)
- Silver Peak Lithium Mine Amendment to Plan of Operations (DOI-BLM-NV-B020-2025-0005-EIS)
- Nevada Gold Mine's Cortez Pits Expansion Project EA
- Robinson Substation Expansion & 525kV Interconnection Project EA/RMP Amendment (DOI-BLM-NV-L060-2025-0012-RMP-EA)
- Silver King Wild Horse Gather and Herd Management Area Plan (DOI-BLM-NV-L030-2025-0011-EA)
- Jackson Mountains Herd Management Area Plan (HMAP) (DOI-BLM-NV-W030-2025-0002-EA)

AVAILABILITY OF THE APPROVED RMP AMENDMENT

Copies of the ROD and the Approved RMP Amendment may be obtained online on the BLM's National NEPA Register at: https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/2016719/510. Limited printed copies are available upon request from the Nevada State Office at 1340 Financial Blvd, Reno, NV 89502 and California State Office at 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California, 95825.

[13] BLM Director's Protest Resolution Report is available at: https://www.blm.gov/programs/planning-and-nepa/public-participation/protest-resolution-reports.

APPROVAL

I hereby certify that BLM has considered all alternatives, information, analyses, and objections submitted by State, Tribal, and local governments, and public commenters for consideration by BLM and cooperating agencies in developing the environmental impact statement. In consideration of the foregoing, I approve the Greater Sage-grouse Rangewide Planning Resource Management Plan Amendment.

Jon K. Raby
BLM Nevada State Director

DEC 22 2025
Date

Joseph Stout
BLM California State Director

DEC 22 2025
Date

Nevada/California Approved RMP Amendment

Goal
Manage lands in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific ecological, and environmental values that will provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestica animals, and that will provide for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and uses consistent with Section 102 of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (as amended). Manage GRSG habitat to support habitat connectivity and persistent, healthy populations, consistent with BLM's Special Status Species (SSS) Management Policy (BLM-M-6840) and in coordination and cooperation with state wildlife agencies and appropriate state authorities.

HABITAT MANAGEMENT AREA ALIGNMENTS

The BLM applies its management allocations and management direction for GRSG within Habitat Management Areas (HMAs). Although the BLM has identified and mapped the HMAs to encompass multiple land ownerships, reflecting the wide-ranging ecological needs of GRSG, the management allocations and management direction that follow only apply to BLM-administered lands, including areas where BLM administers subsurface minerals. Following are the rangewide HMA categories and the additional, Nevada and California BLM-specific HMA definition. The Nevada and California BLM HMA and the State of Nevada's HMA (each representing the same areas) are provided through a published U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) habitat model and prioritization process (currently Milligan et al. 2024). To maintain HMAs that reflect the best available science and current conditions on the landscape, BLM-NV/CA and the State of Nevada recognize and disclose that maps and associated information will be updated periodically. Habitat conditions are dynamic and may vary across the landscape both spatially and temporally, and Map 3 and Table 1 in **Appendix 1**, Table and Maps reflect a snapshot in time of the most likely places where HMA categories occur on the landscape.

The HMA categories provide the criteria by which habitat characteristics are grouped by the model. These criteria are generally defined below by the HMA category definitions, are summarized in greater detail in Appendix 3 of this planning effort's Final EIS and described explicitly in the scientific publications associated with the model (Coates et al. 2014, Coates et al. 2016, Brussee et al. 2019, and Milligan et al. 2024). Future updates to the HMA map will be completed consistent with the criteria defined in Appendix 3 and applicable laws and regulations, including NEPA, and will generally be accomplished using plan maintenance.

Rangewide Habitat Management Areas
Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) have the highest value to maintaining sustainable GRSG populations and can include breeding, late brood-rearing, winter concentration areas, and migration or connectivity corridors. The BLMs intent for these areas is to maintain and enhance habitat conditions that will support persistent and healthy GRSG populations through management to minimize habitat loss and degradation.

Rangewide Habitat Management Areas
General Habitat Management Areas (GHMA) are lands that are, or have the potential to become, occupied seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA, managed to sustain GRSG populations. These areas are defined differentially by state wildlife management agencies but generally are of poorer GRSG habitat quality with reduced occupancy when compared to PHMA. Some state wildlife agencies have identified areas of GHMA as important for restoration, connectivity, or seasonal habitats. The intent for GHMA is to maintain habitat conditions to support GRSG populations consistent with the state agency designations of recovery, connectivity, or seasonal habitats.
Nevada/California
Other Habitat Management Area (OHMA): Areas with appropriate environmental conditions for GRSG that are less used by GRSG or have marginal habitat suitability.

Table 1. Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA) Allocations and Management Direction

This table identifies the allocations and management direction and that will be applied in PHMA. The table describes if the 2025 Approved RMP Amendment is amending the "objective", "allocation", or "management direction" for the resource topic identified. In some instances, the Approved RMP Amendment addresses all three of these planning categories for a resource topic while in other resource topics only one or two of the categories are amended. All three planning categories are identified for each resource topic and if it is not being amended it will be identified as "N/A", not applicable. In those "N/A" instances, the 2015 or 2019 Amendment decision is not being proposed for amendment and remains in place. The existing 2015 and 2019 Amendment decisions are described in **Appendix 2**. Several management actions refer to existing laws, regulations, policies, or technical references. The citations in this document are based on the versions current as of ROD publication; the most current versions of these various references would be used during implementation (e.g., in 2025 the Habitat Assessment Framework is TR-6710-1 dated 2015; updated versions of the HAF or its equivalent would be applied to all actions that reference the HAF).

Maps that show where the allocations and management direction apply can be found in **Appendix 1**, Table and Maps.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Fluid Minerals (including geothermal)
Objective: Manage fluid mineral leasing and development, including geothermal, in GRSG habitat management areas to avoid when practicable, then minimize and voluntarily compensate for adverse impacts to GRSG habitat to the extent required under the law and BLM jurisdiction. **Management Direction:** **Development in Areas Already Leased:** When considering exploration and development on areas leased for fluid mineral resources in PHMAs, application of measures to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate potential impacts will be considered through completion of the requirements at 43 CFR Part 3162.5 (Environmental Review) and 36 CFR Part 228.108 (Surface

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction

Use Requirements). Such measures may include existing lease stipulations, project design, operator-committed measures, RMP required design features (RDFs), and local conditions of approval (COAs).

The BLM will work with project proponents and the state wildlife agency to promote effective management and connectivity of seasonal habitats and PHMAs to accomplish measurable GRSG conservation objectives. Surface use rights associated with existing leases will be recognized and respected. For proposed operations in PHMA, the Surface Use Plan of Operations (refer to 43CFR Part 3162.3-1(f)) shall address, at a minimum, the applicable RDFs in the RMP. RMP-defined project features reducing GRSG impacts not utilized in the Surface Use Plan of Operations based on site-specific or project-specific considerations shall be noted in the project file, along with a rationale for not including them. The BLM will evaluate whether each conservation measure is reasonable and consistent with surface use rights as part of the environmental review process (see 43 CFR Part 3101.12).

Allocations for Unleased Lands: Open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy (NSO) (unless otherwise closed), controlled surface use (CSU), and Timing Limitations (TL). Refer to the following NSO exceptions.

To approve waivers, exceptions or modifications based on any of the listed criteria, after coordination with the appropriate State agency, the Authorized Officer must document that the proposed action satisfies the listed criteria. If the State agency does not concur with granting the exception, the Authorized Officer must provide rationale for how the criteria are met considering the information the State provides.

If the area associated with the proposed development seeking the exception or modification (e.g., well pad, compressor station) is in an area in which one of the adaptive management thresholds has been activated (refer to Adaptive Management Section), no exceptions or modification would be considered until the causal factor analysis is completed. If the causal factor analysis concludes fluid minerals is or could contribute to the threshold being activated or not recovering, no exception or modification would be granted. If the analysis is inconclusive on cause, exceptions or modifications could be considered. Waivers are excluded from this consideration.

Prior to granting a waiver, exception, or modification to any GRSG NSO or Disturbance Cap fluid minerals stipulation, the Authorized Officer shall comply with regulatory public review requirements, if applicable (see 43 CFR 3101).

GRSG No Surface Occupancy (NSO) Exceptions

a) **Exception 1 -** The Authorized Officer may consider and grant an exception to the NSO stipulation within 3.1-miles of active and pending active leks if it is demonstrated that development and surface occupancy **has no direct impacts to or disruption of GRSG or its habitat** based on:
   I. The location of the proposed authorization is determined to be non-habitat (refer to **Appendix 6**, Glossary), does not provide important connectivity between habitat areas (as determined by a wildlife biologist and confirmed by BLM using methods such as the HAF and coordinated with the appropriate state authority) and the project includes RDFs to prevent indirect disturbance to or disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats, regardless of distance from the active lek, that may impair their biological function; **OR**
   II. Topography/areas of non-habitat create an effective barrier to impacts (e.g., protected from visual and audible disturbances to GRSG and its habitat); **OR**
   III. By co-locating the proposed authorization with existing disturbance, no additional impacts will be realized above those already associated with the existing similarly sized infrastructure, including indirect disturbance to or disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats that may impair their biological function.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
b) **Exception 2** - The Authorized Officer may consider and grant an exception to the NSO stipulation associated with the remainder of PHMA beyond 3.1 miles from active leks if it **would not result in adverse effects to GRSG seasonal habitats** based on **one** of the following criteria: I. The criteria presented in Exception #1; **OR** II. The proposed project seeking the exception would not result in adverse effects to GRSG seasonal habitats based on site-specific information and application of the full range of mitigation tools (e.g., avoidance, minimization, voluntary compensation), as documented by a wildlife biologist and confirmed by the BLM. Proponents may demonstrate no adverse effects by mitigating residual impacts using the State of Nevada's Conservation Credit System, consistent with State regulations, or voluntary compensatory mitigation in California. To grant this exception based on the use of voluntary compensatory mitigation, the compensation project must be completed and habitat functionality documented before the exception is granted. The compensation must also provide offsetting benefits to the population being impacted. c) **Exception 3** - An exception could be considered if the proposed location on public lands would be undertaken as an alternative to a similar action occurring on a nearby non-public lands parcel (e.g., due to ownership patterns), and development on the public parcel in question would eliminate impacts on more important and/or limited GRSG habitat (e.g., wet meadows, brood-rearing habitat) on the non-public nearby parcel; this exception must also include measures sufficient to allow the BLM to conclude in its documenting analysis that such benefits will endure for the duration of the proposed action's impacts on public lands (e.g., confirmation of an easement). **GRSG NSO Modifications** The Authorized Officer may consider and grant a modification to the fluid mineral lease NSO stipulation, allowing for surface occupancy only where: 1) an exception is granted as described above for the primary disturbance (e.g., well pad, compressor station), **AND** 2) the potential associated infrastructure related to the development is not individually precluded by other actions (e.g., roads, pipelines, power lines that could otherwise be considered through a ROW). While the NSO stipulation could be modified for these additional developments, they must still comply with other GRSG management actions (e.g., mitigation, disturbance cap, minerals/energy density, seasonal restrictions, RDFs) if an exception to the NSO is granted. **GRSG NSO Waiver** The Authorized Officer may consider and grant a waiver of the NSO stipulation on an existing lease after documenting, in coordination with the appropriate state agency, that the lease with the GRSG NSO stipulation is no longer in PHMA. This will only be applicable on leases that were issued when the parcel was in PHMA, then the PHMA boundaries were subsequently adjusted through the appropriate planning process.
GRSG Disturbance Management Protocol (NV)/Cap (CA) Exceptions and Waivers For fluid mineral disturbance cap exceptions and waivers, including geothermal development, follow the direction for Disturbance Cap exceptions and conditions section.
Disturbance Management Protocol/Cap Modifications None.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Disturbance Management Protocol/Cap Waivers The Authorized Officer may consider and grant a waiver of the stipulation on an existing lease if the area mapped as PHMA when the lease was issued is no longer mapped as such through the appropriate planning process. **GRSG Seasonal Constraints/Stipulations Exception** The Authorized Officer may consider and provide temporary relief from seasonal constraints (identified in the 2019 RMP Amendments, refer to **Appendix 2**) by granting an exception after documenting the review of available information, including best available science, associated with the site proposed for the exception. This direction applies in PHMA, GHMA, and OHMA. While the BLM considers information from all sources, the state wildlife agencies can provide information directly associated with GRSG use, including, if available, whether GRSG populations are not using the seasonal habitat during that year's seasonal life cycle period. Based on this information and recommendation, and documented variability in seasonal conditions (e.g., early/late spring, long/heavy winter), use patterns, or other applicable information the Authorized Officer may consider a one-time exception if development associated with it will not have direct/indirect negative impacts on GRSG populations and/or their habitat. **Seasonal Constraints/Stipulations Modifications** The BLM can grant modifications to seasonal restrictions if the BLM, in coordination with the state wildlife agencies and other appropriate state authorities, on a case-by-case basis, determines that granting the modification will not adversely impact the population being protected. The Authorized Officer may grant a modification to the dates and areas associated with seasonal timing restrictions after documenting the review of available information associated with the site proposed for the modification based on one of the criteria described below: 1) The geographic and temporal conditions demonstrate that any modification (e.g., shortening/extending seasonal timeframes) is justified on the basis that it serves to better protect or enhance GRSG and its habitat than if the strict application of seasonal timing restrictions are implemented. Under this scenario, modifications can occur if one or more of the following conditions can be documented: a. A proposed authorization is expected to have beneficial or neutral impacts on GRSG and its habitat. b. Topography or other factors eliminate direct and indirect impacts from visibility and audibility to GRSG and its habitat. c. There are documented local variations that indicate the seasonal life cycle periods are different than presented. 2) Modifications are needed to address an immediate public health and/or safety concern in a timely manner (e.g., maintaining a road impacted by flooding). **Seasonal Constraints/Stipulations Waiver** The Authorized Officer may consider and grant a waiver of the stipulation on an existing lease if the area that was mapped as a GRSG HMA (regardless of type) when the lease was issued is no longer mapped as such through the appropriate planning process. **Tracking Waivers, Exceptions, or Modifications** Refer to **Appendix 3**, Greater Sage-grouse Monitoring Framework, Measure 6 for tracking requirements.
Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials
Objective: N/A **Allocation**: Closed unless it meets one of the allocation exception criteria outlined in **MD SSS 5**, but Open for new free use permits and Open for the expansion of existing pits subject to seasonal limitations, and provided that the expansion would not adversely impact adjoining habitats. **Management Direction:** N/A

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Nonenergy Leasable Minerals
Objective: N/A **Allocation**: Manage PHMAs as closed to new nonenergy leasable mineral leasing, unless the new nonenergy leasable mineral lease meets one of the allocation exception criteria outlined in **MD SSS 5** or the new nonenergy leasable mineral has coincident occurrence within existing disturbance and is subject to a non-competitive lease. No additional direct or indirect impacts shall result from extraction of the new nonenergy leasable mineral. **Management Direction**: Apply required design features, best management practices, and minimization measures identified in the existing GRSG amendments (refer to **Appendix 2**)
Coal
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** N/A **Management Direction**: No management direction due to the absence of the mineral.
Locatable Minerals
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** Open, unless currently withdrawn. **Management Direction**: N/A
Major Rights of Way
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** Avoidance for new major ROWs (linear features such as overhead transmission lines, distribution pipelines, and large non-linear surface disturbing projects. Refer to **Appendix 6**, Glossary). **Management Direction**: If during consideration of a proposed project-level authorization for a ROW action, the determination of whether it is a major or minor ROW is questioned with supporting rationale, the Authorized Officer, in consultation with the BLM State Office lead(s), will make the final determination. Authorizations may be granted if one of the criteria below and the additional conditions are met. **Major Rights of Way Avoidance Criteria:** 1) RMP designated corridors within PHMA are open to consideration of a new major ROW in the category of ROW for which the corridor was designated if the proposed authorization results in impacts similar to those already described in the environmental analysis to establish the corridor, including indirect disturbance to or disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats; **OR** 2) The ROW can be routed through, or located within non-habitat. Non habitat will be determined by a wildlife biologist and confirmed by the BLM using criteria such as the HAF and coordinated with state wildlife agencies and other appropriate state authority. ROWs shall minimize disruption of connectivity between habitat areas and should be designed to prevent indirect disturbance to or disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats (as disclosed in the environmental analysis). a. Applicants must clearly demonstrate to the Authorized Officer, in consultation with the BLM State Office lead(s) that no viable alternatives exist for placement of facilities outside the avoidance area prior to analyzing placement within an avoidance area.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
b. ROWs may be placed in PHMA if doing so reduces the risk of wildfire, decreases risk to human health and safety, or meets national security needs. The ROW must be the minimum necessary to achieve the ROW's purpose and will not otherwise be viable in an area that is "open" to ROWs; **OR** 3) The proposed location on federal lands will be undertaken as an alternative to a similar action occurring on a nearby non- federal lands parcel, and development on the public parcel in question will eliminate impacts on more important and/or limited GRSG habitat (e.g., wet meadows, brood-rearing habitat) on the non- federal nearby parcel. The ROW must be the minimum necessary to achieve the ROW's purpose and will not otherwise be viable in an area that is "open" to ROWs. *If one or multiple of the avoidance criteria can be met, the ROW must also meet the following conditions in order to be permitted in PHMA:* a) Micro-siting while developing the major ROW is required to limit impacts and maintain connectivity corridors between seasonal habitats. This includes using topography and non-habitat as effective barriers to adverse impacts and co-location with existing, similarly sized, infrastructure; **AND** b) Where the development of the major ROW is outside a designated corridor, apply minimization measures (e.g., disturbance cap, seasonal constraints, tall structure limitations, RDFs, nest and perch deterrents); **AND** c) Residual direct and indirect impacts will be mitigated consistent with state mitigation policies or requirements as applicable. If requiring mitigation both inside and outside of RMP-designated corridors disincentivizes location in the designated corridor or another route that has lesser impacts to GRSG, the Authorized Officer may consider adjusting the mitigation requirement if doing so reduces impacts to GRSG compared to an alignment that otherwise requires mitigation (e.g., development in an RMP-designated corridor that has existing transmission lines already present). The Authorized Officer shall coordinate with the applicable state agencies to ensure compliance with compensatory mitigation to the extent required by state policies or regulations.
Minor Rights-of-Way
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** Avoidance as per direction in the 2015 GRSG plan amendment. **Management Direction:** N/A
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)
No ACECs are designated.
Livestock Grazing
Objective (RM-1): Manage livestock grazing in GRSG habitat in a manner that meets or makes progress toward meeting the Land Health Standard (LHS) 3 in northeastern Nevada and LHS 5 in northwestern Nevada and California, which provide for desired species, including native, threatened, endangered, and special-status species, that are to be maintained at a level appropriate for the site and species involved. Apply the guideline that addresses "restoring, maintaining, or enhancing habitats of...special status species to promote their conservation" (43 CFR Part 4180.2(e)(9) or subsequent changes to regulations or policy). **Allocation (RM-1)**: The presence of GRSG HMAs will not affect whether an area is available for livestock grazing. During livestock grazing authorization renewals, Allotment Management Plan (or its functional equivalent) development, or other appropriate implementation-level planning, the BLM will follow all applicable livestock grazing regulations including 43 CFR Subpart 4120 – Grazing Management and 43 CFR 4180.2 Standards and Guidelines for Grazing Administration or any subsequent revisions and the best management practices and design features in **Appendix 5**. **Management Direction** **RM-1**: During the land health assessment (LHA) process, use the criteria identified in the Sage-Grouse HAF (BLM-TR-6710-1 - Stiver et al. 2015 – as revised) and other BLM approved methodology to provide multiple lines of evidence (consistent with BLM Manual 1283) for determining whether vegetation structure,

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
condition, and composition are meeting or making significant progress towards meeting the LHS 3 in northeastern Nevada and LHS 5 in northwestern Nevada and California by referencing appropriate Ecological Site Description (ESD), associated State and Transition Model (STM), and existing ecological condition information. For GRSG, the standard will generally be met when vegetation conditions provide suitable GRSG habitat at the HAF site-scale (refer to **Table 4-1, Appendix 4**), based on existing ecological condition, ecological potential, and existing vegetation information.
Where the LHS 3 in northeastern Nevada and LHS 5 in northwestern Nevada and California (specific to GRSG) is not being met - as indicated by an unsuitable site-scale HAF assessment relative to site potential, and current livestock grazing is a significant causal factor (43 CFR Part 4180, BLM H-4180-1 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy), adjustments to livestock grazing practices and activities will be made at the authorization, allotment or activity plan level and in accordance with applicable regulations (43 CFR Part 4180.2 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy). Any adjustments to livestock grazing will be made based on current ecological potential according to ESD, associated STM, and existing ecological state.
RM-2: In PHMA, when fully processing livestock grazing authorizations where the LHS 3 in northeastern Nevada and LHS 5 in northwestern Nevada and California is not being met (specific to GRSG habitat) and current livestock grazing has been identified as a significant causal factor (43 CFR Part 4180, BLM H-4180-1 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy), the NEPA analysis must include in at least one alternative with specific thresholds and defined responses that would be included in the terms and conditions of the livestock grazing authorization if that alternative were selected.
One or more defined responses will allow the Authorized Officer to consider adjustments to livestock grazing during the term of the authorization that have already been analyzed through NEPA. Thresholds specific to GRSG habitat will be developed to make significant progress toward fulfillment of the LHS (43 CFR Part 4180.2 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy) and maintain or move PHMA toward providing suitable GRSG habitat (e.g., **Table 4-1, Appendix 4**). Thresholds and defined responses will be designed to address the HAF assessment that warranted the Land Health Evaluation finding while considering ecological site potential, relevant locally specific conditions, and LHS.
RM-3: During the livestock grazing authorization renewal process, evaluate all existing livestock management range improvements with respect to their effect on GRSG and GRSG habitat. Consider removal or modification of projects that negatively affect GRSG or GRSG habitat. Range improvements needed for management of sensitive species habitat or other sensitive resources should be maintained but consider implementing improvements in a manner less impactful to GRSG (Refer to **Appendix 5** for Livestock Grazing Management Best Management Practices and Design Features).
RM-4: Range improvements are any activity or program relating to rangelands which is designed to improve forage, change vegetative composition, control patterns of use, provide water, stabilize soil and water conditions, and provide forage and habitat for livestock and wildlife. Design new range improvement projects to enhance livestock distribution or management and to control the duration, timing and intensity of grazing. They may include, application of new technologies such as voluntary virtual fencing. In PHMA, any new structural range improvements should be placed along existing disturbance corridors or in the least suitable habitat, to the extent practicable, and are subject to appropriate design features (**Appendix 5**) and NEPA.
RM-5: Identify fences in high-risk areas in coordination with the state wildlife agency or other appropriate state authority. Priority should be given to areas within 1.2 miles of an active lek (Christiansen 2009; Stevens 2011), or other areas identified as important seasonal habitats or areas of GRSG concentration. Evaluate if the fence is needed and/or meets BLM wildlife friendly fencing standards (BLM H-1741). If the fence is unnecessary, remove it. If the fence is needed to support management, mark fences with high visibility fence markers in high risk or important areas (Christiansen 2009; Stevens 2011). Where monitoring indicates that fences do not reduce fence-related GRSG mortality, modify fences. Modification could include re-routing, altering construction materials, using seasonal drop fencing, or limiting perching of predators. New fences within high-risk areas will only be authorized if at least one of the following criteria is met: a) It is consistent with the overall RMP GRSG objective; **OR** b) Local terrain features shield nearby habitat or reduce the habitat importance; **OR**

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
c) The fence is constructed with high visibility markers to reduce GRSG strikes. Monitoring existing fences to assess mortality risk is recommended in all GRSG habitats.
Wild Horse and Burro
Objective: N/A **Allocation: N/A** **Management Direction:** **Management Action 1**: Where wild horses and burros overlap with GRSG: a. Manage wild horse and burro populations within established appropriate management levels (AML); **AND** b. Incorporate GRSG habitat objectives into wild horse and burro management (e.g., herd management area plans, AML), monitoring, and gather prioritization, with prioritization of such activities in PHMA, then GHMA; **AND** c. Prioritize gathers in PHMA unless removals are necessary in other areas to address higher priority issues, including herd health impacts. **Management Action 2:** Manage wild horse and burros herd management areas in GRSG habitat (or portions of the herd management area overlapping or within GRSG habitat) within the established AML ranges to achieve and maintain GRSG habitat objectives and achieve or make significant progress towards achieving LHS, considering the full suite of approaches to maintain AML, including temporary fertility control and non-reproducing, or partially non-reproducing herds. **Management Action 3**: If GRSG site scale habitat objectives are not being met in PHMA and GHMA, evaluate AMLs and adjust, if necessary, through the NEPA process where wild horse or burro use is identified as significant causal factor to not meeting LHS, or is a factor in the area not meeting the GRSG habitat objectives.
Predation
Objective: Reduce predation from increased numbers of predators resulting from anthropogenic disturbance and habitat loss and function. **Allocation: N/A** **Management Direction:** **Management Action 1:** Apply minimization measures and BMPs to new, existing, and renewal of authorizations and activities to minimize threats from predators shown to pose a threat to GRSG, consistent with applicable law. This includes, but is not limited to stopping, slowing, and/or discouraging the incursion of predators, increased levels of predators, or predators expanding into new areas. Minimization measures and BMPs include, but are not limited to, the following: a. Limit the footprint for all proposed projects to the smallest area necessary to achieve the project objectives to reduce habitat loss. b. Place project components within existing disturbance areas whenever possible to minimize habitat loss. c. Eliminate or minimize external food resources from anthropogenic sources (e.g., trash resources from human activities, road killed animals, carcass dumps). d. Reduce or prevent opportunities for raven and raptor perching and nesting through such measures as nest/perch deterrents and regular maintenance. **Management Action 2**: For authorizations that require expanded, new, renewal, or non-routine maintenance of energy, mining, or transmission related infrastructure projects as identified in **Table 3-4** in **Appendix 3**, Greater Sage-grouse Monitoring Framework) in PHMA, the project proponent is required to submit a predator subsidy management plan to minimize influx and support of predators as a result of the project. (Refer to **Glossary** for definition

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
of "non-routine maintenance".) The requirement to prepare a predator subsidy management plan could be waived as a result of site-specific circumstances and with appropriate State Director[14] concurrence. The plan shall be coordinated with state and federal agencies (e.g., USFWS and APHIS) as appropriate. The predator subsidy management plan will: a) Outline how the project will be designed to minimize threats to GRSG beyond the natural range of variability from predators; b) Describes project design features to reduce or eliminate predator subsidies (e.g., reducing raven and raptor perching and nesting by burying powerlines, removing trash food subsidies, minimizing infrastructure, locating any necessary structures out of line of site of breeding and nesting habitat, using tubular non-branching material for structures); c) Describe and outline the coordination and concurrence with state and federal agencies, if appropriate (e.g., USFWS, APHIS). The project proponent may participate in non-lethal control of predators (e.g., removal of raven nests before eggs are present) with written consent and permits from the appropriate agency and as determined at the site-specific NEPA analysis; and d) Include a monitoring strategy to assess efficacy of the predator subsidy management plan and GRSG population response. **Management Action 3:** The BLM will collaborate with appropriate state agencies, other landowners, federal agencies (e.g., USFWS, APHIS), and Tribal governments, as appropriate and consistent with BLM policy, in their efforts to minimize impacts from predators on GRSG where impacts have been documented, including providing needed authorizations to support predator management actions.
Application of Habitat Objectives
Objective: **Objective SSS 7:** Within GRSG HMAs provide suitable habitat by managing for connected mosaics of sagebrush and associated communities that provide for seasonal habitats, dispersal, and migration, while limiting widespread anthropogenic disturbances and fragmentation. This objective will be accomplished by applying RMP land use allocations and management actions among HMAs, proactive habitat treatments, and project-level application of mitigation (refer to Mitigation direction in this Approved RMP Amendment) for internal and external project proposals. **Objective SSS 8:** Manage GRSG HMAs to provide seasonal habitats at the HAF site-scale (Level 4) by providing for habitat characteristics that support seasonal habitat needs, including adequate protective cover and food needed to survive and reproduce. Seasonal habitats may include areas where sagebrush is the current dominant vegetation type, sagebrush is a primary shrub species within the various states of the ecological site or dominated by other vegetation types but still providing GRSG habitats, such as mesic areas. This objective will be accomplished through the combination of RMP land use allocations and management actions and restoration based on ecological potential, current vegetative condition, and existing seasonal values, and the project-level application of mitigation refer to Mitigation direction in this Approved RMP Amendment) for internal and external project proposals. **Allocation:** N/A **Management Direction:** **Management Action SSS 25:** Assess the suitability of GRSG habitat at HAF mid- and fine-scales (HAF Levels 2 and 3, respectively) based on the methods in the HAF (Stiver et al. 2015, BLM TR 6710-1, as revised; see **Appendix 4**). **Management Action SSS 26:** Design and implement projects that will maintain or improve habitat suitability, availability, and connectivity, based on site location, existing seasonal values, and habitat needs using the results of mid- and fine-scale habitat assessments and other complementary research, tools, or information and in coordination with partners across land management jurisdictions.

[14] The California State Office and California State Director administer 1.1 million acres in northwest Nevada and is the Authorized Officer for these BLM lands.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Management Action SSS 27: Assess suitability of GRSG habitat at the HAF site-scale (Level 4) based on the methods in HAF (Stiver et al. 2015, BLM TR 6710-1, as revised; **Appendix 4**) utilizing current geographically applicable research on seasonal habitat requisites of GRSG (see **Appendix 4**). Updates to seasonal habitat indicators and ESDs will be developed locally and coordinated with partners (see **Appendix 4**). **Management Action SSS 28:** Maintain, improve, or restore the suitability of GRSG seasonal habitats using the Habitat Indicators Table (see **Appendix 4**) to inform measurable project objectives during implementation-level planning for BLM-permitted and BLM-initiated site-specific actions in HMAs, in coordination with applicable partners. Use the results of site-scale habitat assessments and other best available information to inform management decisions and the design and implementation of habitat projects.
Mitigation
Objective SSS 4: When authorizing third-party actions in designated GRSG HMAs, the BLM will apply avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts, while seeking to achieve the planning-level goals and objectives for GRSG and its habitat, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. Management will be consistent with the GRSG goals and objectives, and in conformance with BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. Specifically, the BLM will authorize uses of the public lands that are consistent with the policy in BLM Manual 6840 and therefore "minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of [GRSG]" or "improve the condition of [GRSG] habitat." **Allocation:** None **Management Direction:** **MD SSS 2:** In PHMAs, the following conditions will be met in order to avoid and minimize impacts to GRSG and its habitat. The BLM will consider compensatory mitigation actions only when offered voluntarily by a project proponent; when required by law; or as a component of compliance with a States' mitigation plan, program, or authority, such as required by the State of Nevada Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law) **MD MIT 1:** When authorizing third-party actions in GRSG HMAs, the BLM will seek to achieve the planning-level GRSG management goals and objectives through implementation of mitigation and management actions, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. Management will be consistent with the GRSG goals and objectives, and in conformance with BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. In accordance with BLM Manual 6840, the BLM will undertake planning decisions, actions and authorizations "to minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of [GRSG] or to improve the condition of [GRSG] habitat" across the planning area. The BLM will consider compensatory mitigation only when offered voluntarily by a project proponent; when required by law ; or as a component of compliance with a state mitigation plan, program, or authority, such as required by State of Nevada Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law). In accordance with the State's goals for managing GRSG, the plans modify the net conservation gain standard for compensatory mitigation to clarify that the BLM would pursue net benefit/net conservation gain (as required by the State of Nevada) as a broader planning goal and objective. This means that the BLM would continue to require avoidance, minimization, and other onsite mitigation to adequately conserve GRSG and its habitat, while remaining committed to implementing beneficial habitat management actions to reduce the threats of fire and invasive species. The BLM would focus on avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, and reducing impacts over time. Compensation, which involves replacing or providing substitute resources for the impacts (including through payments to fund such work), would be considered only when voluntarily offered by a proponent, required by a law other than FLPMA, or to meet a State requirement. The BLM commits to cooperating with the State to analyze applicant-proposed or state-imposed compensatory mitigation to offset residual impacts. The BLM remains committed to achieving the planning-level management goals and objectives identified in this

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
ROD and the 2015 and 2019 ARMPAs by ensuring GRSG habitat impacts are addressed through implementing mitigating actions consistent with the governing RMP. In all GRSG habitat, before authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation within the State of Nevada, the BLM will complete the following steps, in alignment with the State of Nevada's Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan (2014, as amended), including avoiding, minimizing, and compensating for impacts by applying beneficial mitigation actions: 1. Notify the State of Nevada's Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team to determine if the State requires or recommends any mitigation – including avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation – under the States' regulations, policies, or programs, such as required by the State of Nevada's Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law), related to the conservation of GRSG. 2. Incorporate the States' required or recommended mitigation into the BLM's NEPA decision-making process, if the State of Nevada's Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team determines that there are unacceptable residual impacts on GRSG or its habitat and compensatory mitigation is required as a part of the State's policy or authorization, such as required by the State of Nevada's Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law), or if a proponent voluntarily offers mitigation. 3. Verify that the project proponent has coordinated with the State of Nevada's Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team to ensure it complies with the State of Nevada's Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan (2014, as amended) and all applicable State requirements relating to its proposal. The BLM will cooperate with the States to determine appropriate project design and alignment with the States' policies and requirements, including those regarding compensatory mitigation, such as the State of Nevada's Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law). When the BLM is considering compensatory mitigation as a component of the project proponent's submission or based on a requirement of or recommendation from the States, the BLM's NEPA analysis will evaluate the need to avoid or minimize impacts of the proposed project and achieve the goals and objectives of this Approved RMPA. With respect to any State compensatory mitigation requirements, the BLM will defer to the appropriate State authority to quantify habitat offsets, durability, and other aspects used to determine the recommended compensatory mitigation action. The BLM will not deny a proposed authorization in GRSG habitat solely on the grounds that the proponent has not proposed or agreed to undertake voluntary compensatory mitigation, unless required by an existing States' authority such as the State of Nevada's Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law). The BLM will ensure project design is aligned with the States' requirements — including compensatory mitigation — that may be necessary to comply with State's policies and programs for the conservation of GRSG. Where compensatory mitigation is required as part of a States' plan, program, or authority, such as Nevada State Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law), the BLM will include the required mitigation in all of its action alternatives in a NEPA analysis. **MD MIT 2:** On BLM-administered lands within Nevada and California, when authorizing third-party actions that will result in direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on GRSG or their habitat, the BLM will defer to the State of Nevada's most current version of the Habitat Quantification Tool (HQT) to quantify those impacts to ensure consistency in tracking and reporting changes to GRSG habitat quality and quantity.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA
Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Disturbance Management Protocol in the State of Nevada

Objective: N/A
Allocation: N/A
Management Direction:
This management direction applies to the State of Nevada. Management direction for the State of California is described in the next section. This Approved RMP Amendment has incorporated a 3% disturbance management protocol for GRSG PHMAs. The following Disturbance Management Protocol (DMP) is intended to provide for a 3 percent limitation on disturbance, with certain exceptions described below, including those where a net conservation gain to the species can be achieved, as a component of compliance with a state mitigation plan, program, or authority, such as the Nevada Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan and Conservation Credit System (CCS) as required by Nevada regulation (NRS Chapter 232.162 and NAC 232.400 – 232.480, and any future regulations adopted by the State of Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law). The DMP provides a mechanism to monitor the amount of disturbance and identify where avoidance of additional disturbance or restoration of previous disturbance is warranted, consistent with BLM management. It also provides information for the consideration of cumulative impacts. Details regarding the protocol, disturbance calculations, and exceptions are described below.

Note: The California State Office and California State Director administer 1.1 million acres in northwest Nevada and is the Authorized Officer for these BLM lands.

If direct habitat anthropogenic disturbance from existing and proposed infrastructure developments exceeds either:

1) 3% at the project scale (refer to description below), or
2) 3% at the HAF fine-scale habitat selection area.

New infrastructure projects will be subject to the disturbance management protocol:

a. Until such time as the percentage of habitat disturbance in the areas has been reduced below the 3% threshold through restoration of existing disturbance to meeting habitat objectives or increasing the amount of suitable habitat through restoration, or
b. Redesigned to not result in additional surface disturbance (co-location), redesigned to move it outside of habitat in PHMA (refer to non-habitat criteria), or redesigned to move it outside PHMA.

Disturbance Calculation
Numerator
The disturbance calculation is limited to the following specific activities, whether existing projects or new proposals (refer to **Appendix 3** for additional details on how these items will be monitored):

- Oil and gas wells and development facilities
- Coal mines
- Wind projects (e.g., towers, sub-stations)
- Solar fields
- Geothermal development facilities

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
• Mining (active locatable, nonenergy leasable and saleable/mineral material developments)[15] • Roads, defined as transportation features with a maintenance intensity of level 3 or 5(refer to BLM Technical Note 422 – Roads and Trails Terminology, 2006 or as updated); this definition does not include two-tracks) • Railroads • Power lines • Communication towers • Other vertical infrastructure, as well as developed rights-of-way with habitat loss (e.g., pipelines) In addition to the specific activities listed above, the following additional activities will be incorporated into the numerator at the project scale: • Coal bed methane ponds • Meteorological towers (e.g., wind energy testing) • Nuclear energy facilities • Airport facilities and infrastructure • Hydroelectric plants/facilities Where such data are available, this disturbance is measured by the footprint of direct disturbance of the PHMA where habitat is removed including staging areas, dispersed structures, parking lots, and equipment storage areas; or by the distance between the outermost lines for transmission lines. A disturbed area is included in the numerator until it has been restored to provide equal or improved habitat function as was provided by the area before the disturbance. When considering new project proposals, any project associated with the above list that has been approved/authorized but not yet constructed should be treated as though it were already constructed when calculating the disturbance to account for authorized but not yet constructed disturbance. No other activities or actions beyond those listed above are included when calculating the disturbance at either scale (e.g., wildfire, agriculture, vegetation treatments, residences, barns, fencing or range improvements). The BLM will coordinate with State agencies and use available HAF and land health data in determining if the habitat function of an area has been restored. Consistent with the BLM's responsibility to consider cumulative impacts when making decisions for activities on public lands, the disturbance percentage includes acres from the above disturbances regardless of land ownership, where such data are available. This will only inform decision-making on public lands and cannot impact private property rights. <u>Denominator</u> At the project scale, the assessment area (denominator) is determined by identifying the extent of the PHMA that supports the GRSG population potentially affected by the proposed project that is also located in PHMA; it is not to be limited to the area where indirect impacts are anticipated. The project scale denominator should include the PHMA used by the potentially affected local GRSG population, including the associated seasonal habitats and the transition zones between those habitats (only within PHMA) associated with where the project is proposed.

[15] Although locatable mine sites are included in the degradation calculation, mining activities under the 1872 mining law may not be subject to the Disturbance Management Protocol. Details about locatable mining activities will be fully disclosed and analyzed in the NEPA process to assess impacts to sage-grouse and their habitat as well as to BLM goals and objectives, and other BLM programs and activities.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
If sufficient monitoring information is not available to identify the portions of the PHMA used by the potentially affected local GRSG population, identify project level boundaries using an approach similar to the DDCT approach developed by the State of Wyoming: 1) Determine potentially affected active leks by placing a 4-mile buffer around the proposed area of physical disturbance related to the proposed project. All active leks located within the 4-mile project buffer and within PHMA will be considered affected by the project. 2) Next, place a 4-mile buffer around each of the affected active leks. 3) All PHMA within the 4-mile project buffer, combined with the 4-mile lek buffer(s), creates the project analysis area for each individual project, absent other monitoring data. If there are no active leks within the 4-mile project buffer, the project scale analysis area will be that portion of the 4-mile project buffer within PHMA. "Pending leks" and other similarly defined state-based lek categories can be considered as active leks based on inclusion from the state wildlife agency or appropriate state authority. At the HAF fine-scale, the assessment area (denominator) is the acres of PHMA within the boundaries of the HAF fine-scale habitat delineation area. Calculation of the 3% threshold will include all acres of PHMA in the fine-scale area as the denominator. At either scale, all areas in PHMA will be included in the denominator unless specific information documents areas of non-habitat or unsuitable habitat (e.g., assessment process described in the Criteria Based Management for Non-habitat section, seasonal habitat maps for the HAF fine-scale assessment area, areas that are unsuitable for all seasonal habitats using HAF site-scale techniques). These areas are treated neither as habitat nor disturbance, which results in the area being removed from the denominator piece of the formula. The denominator includes all lands, regardless of land ownership, to help the BLM consider the cumulative impacts of disturbances on GRSG when considering projects on public lands. **Project Exception Criteria and Conditions** Authorized Officer may consider projects on public lands that could result in exceeding the disturbance threshold across all ownership at the project scale if the project meets the criteria for one of the following categories of exceptions and meets the following conditions applicable to that exception: **Exception Criteria:** a. If the disturbance is associated with the renewal or re-authorization of existing infrastructure in previously disturbed sites or expansions of existing infrastructure that do not result in new direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on GRSG and its habitat, and is documented. b. If a technical team evaluates and concludes site-specific GRSG habitat and population information, combined with project design elements – including voluntary or state-required compensatory mitigation, indicates the proposed project is expected to improve the condition of GRSG habitat within the proposed project analysis area. The technical team should consist of, at a minimum, a BLM field office biologist and a biologist from the appropriate state agency. The methods, rationale, and data used in developing recommendations shall be retained as part of the project record. c. If the disturbance is within an RMP designated utility corridors, the disturbance threshold may be exceeded if site-specific NEPA analysis indicates doing so will decrease impacts to GRSG habitat in comparison to siting a project outside the designated corridor. This exception is limited to projects that fulfill the use for which the corridors were designated (e.g., transmission lines, pipelines) and the designated width of a corridor will not be exceeded as a result of any project co-location. (Note: A plan amendment will be required for the development of new corridors and, as necessary, will need to appropriately address any changes in the DMP.) d. If the environmental review document(s) explains how the GRSG RMP goals and objectives will be met, including avoidance first (e.g., locating the proposed projects outside PHMA, colocation within footprint of existing disturbance), then minimization, including application of RDFs, with appropriate documentation. The environmental review document must also consider the cumulative effects of other exceptions granted in adjacent project scale

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
units. If avoidance is not possible and minimization does not address all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, voluntary compensatory mitigation can be considered, in coordination with the appropriate State agency. **If one or more of the exception criteria can be met, the activity associated with the disturbance must also meet all of the following conditions in order to be permitted:** a. If the exception relies on voluntary compensatory mitigation, and also in compliance with state authorities: 1. the mitigation must be completed prior to the disturbance that results in the exceedance of the DMP and provide the same or better value habitat based on site limitations, or better based on site limitations, **AND** 2. The compensation must be implemented in the same HAF fine-scale unit as the potential development. Consideration may be given to providing compensatory mitigation in adjacent fine-scale HAF areas if doing so will more effectively provide the offsetting benefit. b. All DMP exceptions MUST have concurrence from the appropriate State Director[16]. If a proposed DMP exception is requested in a neighborhood lek cluster or an alternative adaptive management unit that has met one of the adaptive management thresholds, the DMP at the project scale will limit projects that contribute to the cause of the exceedance, unless the disturbance is needed for the protection of human life and safety, as concurred by the appropriate State Director. The California State Director will notify the Nevada State Director of concurrence with any exceptions in the 1.1 million acres in Nevada that are managed by the California State Office. c. DMP exceptions (either Project or HAF Fine scale) will be tracked and considered in analyses for any proposed development within the same neighborhood cluster or appropriate biological area. d. Exceptions to the 3% PHMA DMP at the HAF fine-scale may be made if: i. The disturbance is needed for the protection of human life and safety, as concurred by the appropriate BLM State Director. ii. The Authorized Officer, with concurrence of the appropriate State Director, may grant an exception if the project meets criteria associated with the project-scale assessment including requirements for exceptions and conditions, is in compliance with the Nevada Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan and CCS as required by Nevada regulation (NRS Chapter 232.162 and NAC 232.400 – 232.480), and the offsetting compensatory mitigation occurs within the HAF fine-scale where the project occurs. Per above regulatory requirements, the CCS was developed to provide compensatory mitigation and to achieve a net conservation gain to GRSG habitat on public lands in Nevada. The use of the CCS to offset impacts to GRSG is mandated by NAC 232.400 – 232.480. e. In the event of a conflict between the project scale and HAF fine-scale DMP assessments, the Authorized Officer may consider and grant an exception at the HAF fine-scale if, in coordination with the appropriate state agency, it is determined that the impact to GRSG of the habitat disturbance resulting in exceedance of the disturbance threshold is better assessed at the project scale. f. Apply the DMP to the extent consistent with applicable laws and valid existing rights. Mining activities under the 1872 mining law may not be subject to the DMP.

[16] The California State Office and California State Director administer 1.1 million acres in northwest Nevada and is the Authorized Officer for these BLM lands.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Disturbance Cap in the State of California
Management Direction: **Objective**: N/A **Allocation**: N/A **Management Direction**: If direct habitat anthropogenic disturbance from existing and proposed infrastructure developments exceeds either: 1) 3% at the project scale (refer to description below) or 2) 3% at the HAF fine-scale habitat selection area; New infrastructure projects would be deferred to the extent allowable under applicable laws, or valid existing rights: a. until such time as the percentage of habitat disturbance in the areas has been reduced below the cap threshold through restoration of existing disturbance to meeting habitat objectives or increasing the amount of suitable habitat through restoration, or b. redesigned to not result in additional surface disturbance (co-location), redesigned to move it outside of habitat in PHMA (refer to non-habitat criteria in this table), or redesigned to move it outside PHMA. **Disturbance Cap Calculation** <u>Numerator</u> The disturbance cap calculation is limited to the following specific activities, whether existing projects or new proposals (refer to **Appendix 3** for additional details on how these items would be monitored): • Oil and gas wells and development facilities • Coal mines • Wind developments (e.g., towers, sub-stations) • Solar fields • Geothermal development facilities • Mining (active locatable, nonenergy leasable and saleable/mineral material developments) • Roads; transportation features with a maintenance intensity of level 3 or 5 – (BLM Technical Note 422 – Roads and Trails Terminology, 2006 or as updated) and does not include two-tracks • Railroads • Power lines • Communication towers • Other vertical infrastructure, as well as developed rights-of-way with habitat loss (e.g., pipelines) In addition to the specific activities listed above, the following additional activities will be incorporated into the numerator at the project scale: • Coal bed methane ponds • Meteorological towers (e.g., wind energy testing) • Nuclear energy facilities)

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
• Airport facilities and infrastructure • Hydroelectric plants/facilities (at the project scale) Where such data are available, this disturbance is measured by the footprint of direct disturbance of the PHMA area where habitat is removed (including staging areas, dispersed structures, parking lots, and equipment storage areas), or by the distance between the outermost lines for transmission lines. A disturbed area is included in the numerator until it has been restored to provide equal or improved habitat function as was provided by the area before the disturbance. When considering new project proposals, any project associated with the above list that has been approved/authorized but not yet constructed should be treated as though it were already constructed when calculating the disturbance cap to account for authorized but not yet constructed disturbance. No other activities or actions beyond those listed above are included when calculating the cap (e.g., wildfire, agriculture, vegetation treatments, residences, barns, fencing or range improvements, etc.). BLM will coordinate with state agencies and use available HAF and land health data in determining if the habitat function of an area has been restored. Consistent with the BLM's responsibility to consider cumulative impacts when making decisions for activities on public lands, the disturbance percentage includes acres from the above disturbances regardless of land ownership, where such data are available. This will only inform decision-making on public lands and cannot impact private property rights. Wildfire and agriculture would not be included in the numerator at the HAF fine-scale. <u>Denominator</u> At the project scale, the assessment area (denominator) is determined by identifying the extent of the GRSG PHMA that supports the GRSG population potentially affected by the proposed project that is also located in PHMA ; it is not to be limited to the area where indirect impacts are anticipated. The project scale denominator should include the PHMA used by the potentially affected local GRSG population, including the associated seasonal habitats and the transition zones between those habitats within PHMA associated with where the project is proposed. If sufficient monitoring information is not available to identify the portions of the PHMA used by the potentially affected local GRSG population, identify project level boundaries using an approach similar to the DDCT approach developed by the State of Wyoming: 1) Determine potentially affected active leks by placing a 4-mile buffer around the proposed area of physical disturbance related to the proposed project. All active leks located within the 4-mile project buffer and within PHMA will be considered affected by the project. 2) Next, place a 4-mile buffer around each of the affected active leks. 3) All PHMA within the 4-mile project buffer, combined with the 4-mile lek buffer(s), creates the project analysis area for each individual project, absent other monitoring data. If there are no active leks within the 4-mile project buffer, the project scale analysis area will be that portion of the 4-mile project buffer within PHMA. "Pending leks" and other similarly defined state-based lek categories can be considered as active leks based on inclusion from the state wildlife agency or appropriate state authority. At the HAF fine-scale, denominator is the acres of PHMA within the boundaries of the HAF fine-scale habitat delineation area. Calculation of the 3% cap would include all acres of PHMA in the fine-scale area as the denominator. At either scale, all areas in PHMA would be included in the denominator unless specific information documents areas of non-habitat or unsuitable habitat (e.g., assessment process described in the Criteria Based Management for Non-habitat section, seasonal habitat maps for the HAF fine-scale assessment area, areas that are unsuitable for all seasonal habitats using HAF site-scale techniques). These areas are treated neither as habitat nor disturbance, which results in the area being removed from the denominator piece of the formula. The denominator includes all lands, regardless of land ownership, to help the BLM consider the cumulative impacts of disturbances on GRSG when considering projects on public lands.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Disturbance Cap Exceptions Authorized Officer may consider projects on public lands that could result in exceeding the disturbance cap across all ownership at the **project scale** only if the project meets the criteria for one of the following categories of exceptions and also meets the following conditions applicable to that exception: **Categories** for **Disturbance Cap Exceptions:** a. If the disturbance is associated with the renewal or re-authorization of existing infrastructure in previously disturbed sites or expansions of existing infrastructure that do not result in new direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on GRSG and its habitat, and is documented. b. If a technical team evaluates and concludes site-specific GRSG habitat and population information, combined with project design elements – including voluntary compensatory mitigation, indicates the proposed project is expected to improve the condition of GRSG habitat within the proposed project analysis area. The technical team should consist of, at a minimum, a BLM field office biologist and a biologist from the appropriate state agency. The methods, rationale, and data used in developing recommendations shall be retained as part of the project record. c. If the disturbance is within an RMP designated utility corridors, the disturbance cap may be exceeded if site specific NEPA analysis indicates doing so will decrease impacts to GRSG habitat in comparison to siting a project outside the designated corridor. This exception is limited to projects that fulfill the use for which the corridors were designated (e.g., transmission lines, pipelines) and the designated width of a corridor will not be exceeded as a result of any project co-location. The disturbance cap cannot exceed 3% at the HAF fine-scale. A plan amendment would be required for the development of new corridors and, as necessary, would need to appropriately address any changes in the disturbance cap. d. If the environmental review document(s) explains how the GRSG RMP goals and objectives will be met, including avoidance first (e.g., locating the proposed projects outside PHMA, colocation within footprint of existing disturbance), then minimization (including application of RDFs, etc.) with appropriate documentation. The environmental review document must also consider the cumulative effects of other exceptions granted in adjacent project scale units. If avoidance is not possible and minimization does not address all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, voluntary compensatory mitigation can be considered, in coordination with the appropriate state agency. **If one or more of the exception criteria can be met, the activity associated with the disturbance must also meet all of the following conditions in order to be permitted:** a. All disturbance cap exceptions MUST have concurrence from the State Director. b. If the exception relies on voluntary compensatory mitigation: 1. The mitigation must be completed prior to the disturbance that results in the exceedance of the disturbance cap and provide the same or better value habitat based on site limitations, or better based on site limitations, **AND** 2. The compensation must be implemented in the same HAF fine-scale unit as the potential development. Consideration may be given to providing compensatory mitigation in adjacent fine-scale HAF areas if doing so will more effectively provide the offsetting benefit. c. If proposed disturbance cap exception is requested in an area that has met one of the adaptive management thresholds, no exceptions to the disturbance cap at the project scale would be considered until the causal factor analysis is completed and the cause identified and corrected unless the disturbance is needed for the protection of human life and safety. d. Disturbance cap exceptions (either Project or HAF fine scale) will be tracked and considered in analyses for any proposed development within an appropriate biological area. All requests for the use of compensatory mitigation to exceed the disturbance cap should be reviewed by the technical team for likelihood of success and efficacy of offsetting impacts to the affected habitats and associated populations.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
e. There would be no exceptions to the 3% PHMA disturbance cap at the **HAF fine-scale** in any state unless: i. The disturbance is needed for the protection of human life and safety. f. In the event of a conflict between the project scale and HAF fine-scale disturbance caps, the Authorized Officer may consider and grant an exception to the disturbance cap at the HAF fine-scale if, in coordination with the appropriate state agency, it is determined that the impact to GRSG of the habitat disturbance resulting in the disturbance cap being met is better assessed at the project scale. g. Apply the disturbance cap to the extent consistent with applicable law and valid existing rights.
Adaptive Management
Objective: Address unanticipated negative impacts to Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) from changes in habitat conditions before consequences become severe or irreversible. **Allocation:** N/A **Management Action:** The BLM will implement adaptive management per the following Management Action to inform appropriate responses to the loss or degradation of GRSG habitat on BLM-administered lands. Where the State has an adaptive management process as part of the State's GRSG management plan, program, policy, regulation, or authority, the BLM will participate in and implement the most recent State adaptive management process, consistent with the framework outlined in **Appendix 9**. If a State is developing an adaptive management process, the BLM will participate in developing that process and, as appropriate, any state-level interagency adaptive management team. The BLM must consider the best available information about GRSG habitat and population status, which includes the States' data and other available science. States have ownership over managing GRSG populations and therefore lead the collection of GRSG population monitoring data and determination of population status (e.g., increasing, decreasing, or stable). The States' population monitoring is important for informing effective GRSG habitat management on BLM-administered lands. In coordination with State GRSG authorities and state-level interagency adaptive management teams, BLM will produce an annual summary of GRSG habitat conditions and population status, adaptive management thresholds, and any associated adaptive management responses and decisions for BLM-administered lands. This will be completed by a mutually agreed-upon date. BLM's annual summaries will include population status input and recommendations from State GRSG authorities. BLM will coordinate with State GRSG authorities regarding management decisions made in response to adaptive management thresholds and subsequent causal factor analyses and will make decisions for the management of BLM managed surface lands and mineral estate. If no adaptive management thresholds are identified during a given year, an annual review of habitat and population status by state-level interagency adaptive management teams (including State GRSG authorities) is nonetheless encouraged. Consistent with State GRSG adaptive management processes and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act ("FLPMA"), the BLM will implement the GRSG adaptive management framework outlined in **Appendix 9** in coordination with state-level interagency adaptive management teams.[17] BLM Nevada and California will develop an implementation-level Memorandum of Understanding with the State of Nevada to identify roles and responsibilities and address any potential inconsistencies between the State of Nevada's adaptive management plan and the BLM's adaptive management framework.

[17] The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) requires the BLM, to "resolv[e], to the extent practical, inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal Government plans," and achieve consistency with State and local plans to the maximum extent that the BLM finds to be consistent with the laws governing public lands. 43 USC 1712(c)(9). See also 43 CFR 1610.3-1.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA
Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Criteria Based Management for Non-Habitat

Objective: N/A
Allocation: No allocation identified but allocations can be affected if non-habitat criteria are met
Management Direction (can affect HMA allocation and management direction, see Tables above):
Habitat management areas include areas where the BLM will apply goals, objectives, and management actions for conservation of GRSG. The HMAs are identified using inventory data on habitat use and occupancy and reflect the dynamic nature of the vegetation communities that make-up GRSG habitat. The HMA boundaries are not identified using survey-grade assessments (e.g., comprehensive on-the-ground surveys and edge verifications) and, in some states, are the result of large-scale modeling. Therefore, not every acre within an HMA boundary may be GRSG habitat. Additionally, because GRSG habitat use and occupancy and vegetation communities are dynamic, the BLM will use up-to-date high-quality information, including field investigations to adjust the management actions to be applied within identified HMA boundaries. In accordance with existing law, regulation and policy, inventories will continue to be conducted to provide information on GRSG habitat and distribution (BLM Manual 6840).

Non-habitat consists of areas that lack the ecological potential to provide principal habitat components necessary to support GRSG. In the mapped GRSG HMAs, there may be areas of non-habitat where conformance with the RMP will not support GRSG conservation. Refer to definitions for existing habitat, potential habitat, and non-habitat in **Appendix 6**, Glossary. If during consideration of a project level authorization within PHMA, GHMA, and OHMA potential non-habitat is identified by the BLM, a project-specific review should be conducted by a wildlife biologist or reviewed and accepted for confirmation by the BLM. This review should use published, scientific methods (preferably more than one) for identifying GRSG habitat (e.g., Stiver et al., 2015, as revised, ESDs and associated STMs) and be coordinated with the appropriate state agencies. Any discrepancies between the mapped GRSG HMAs and the site-specific conditions will be disclosed, with supporting data (e.g., vegetation monitoring, state and transition models, ecological site descriptions, etc.) and analyzed as a component of the NEPA process. However, indirect and direct impacts to adjacent GRSG populations and their habitats, including potential habitat, still need to be considered when planning and authorizing projects in these non-habitat areas.

All management objectives and decisions associated with each management area type will apply unless all the following criteria are documented:

1. Project is proposed in verified non-habitat.
2. There are no indirect impacts to adjacent habitat or individual or populations of GRSG occupying these adjacent areas due to project design and required design features (e.g., minimize noise, preclude tall structures, require perch deterrents, etc.), as demonstrated in the project's NEPA document. Indirect impact consideration includes the following:
    (1) The project does not impact connectivity:
        i. Within or between populations, or
        ii. Between seasonal habitats (e.g., nesting, early brood rearing, winter, etc.), or
        iii. Within or between existing habitats.
3. Any project related access through/across GRSG habitat (as verified through site-specific field checks) only occurs on existing routes, and the proposed action will not include new roads or upgrades to roads that will change the vehicle use, vehicle type, or traffic volume during the applicable season of GRSG use, subject to valid existing rights, throughout all stages of the proposed project.
4. Coordination with the appropriate state and federal agency biologists and other appropriate staff has been documented. If coordination is not possible the reasons will be documented.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
All proposed actions, including those in the same area, will need to undergo individual analysis to confirm the criteria are met prior to authorization. Exempting a proposed project from management associated with the HMA type will not change the GRSG habitat management area boundaries as identified in the Approved RMP Amendment. The project-specific review to consider which HMA type and associated management (e.g., in PHMA, GHMA, OHMA) is appropriate based on landscape and habitat attributes, can include areas that provide more, or less, conservation value than the current designation identifies as well as areas of non-habitat. The project-specific review will include representatives from BLM, Nevada Division of Wildlife (NDOW), and the Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team (SETT) at a minimum in Nevada and will include appropriate state representatives in California. The assessment will include model results, spatial analyses, and field derived information. USGS may be included in the project-specific review to advise on model accuracy and identification of model parameters that resulted in the mapped categorization. Consistent application of management in areas that meet the criteria for HMAs or non-habitat is the primary objective of this collaborative review and the reviewers will not consider the type or need for the associated project in making a recommendation. The determination to exempt a proposed project from the management actions that will otherwise be required based on maps in this Approved RMP Amendment must be approved by the appropriate State Director[18].
Definition of Lek
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** N/A **Management Direction:** Use the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) lek definitions (Cook et. al., 2022). (Refer to **Appendix 6**, Glossary). When language in the RMP uses the term "active lek" it applies to the WAFWA definition for "active lek" and "pending active lek".
Utility Scale Solar
Utility scale solar projects are projects with nameplate capacity (theoretical output registered with authorities) of 5 megawatt (MW) or higher that deliver electricity to the electricity transmission grid (refer to **Appendix 6**, Glossary). **Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Utility scale solar testing and development is excluded from all PHMA; development as ancillary support for other approved uses (e.g., mineral developments, data centers) could occur if one of the exceptions can be met. **Management Direction:** **Exception Criteria** Apply Exception Criteria as defined in the Fluid Mineral Lease Exceptions.
Utility Scale Wind
Utility-scale wind projects are projects larger than 1 megawatt (MW) (refer to **Appendix 6**, Glossary). **Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Exclusion for utility scale wind testing and development (including met towers). **Management Direction:** **Exception Criteria:** None

[18] The California State Office and California State Director administer 1.1 million acres in northwest Nevada and is the Authorized Officer for these BLM lands.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Special Status Species
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** N/A **Management Direction:** **MD SSS 1:** Work with the proponent/applicant, whether in accordance with a valid existing right or not, and use the following screening criteria to avoid effects of the proposed human activity on GRSG: A. First priority—locate project/activity outside PHMAs and GHMAs while avoiding and/or minimizing direct and indirect impacts to GRSG and/or their habitat; B. Second priority—if the project/activity cannot be placed outside PHMAs and GHMAs, locate and adjust the project/activity to: a. avoid and/or minimize indirect impacts to lekking and source areas (e.g., see PHMA+ source areas in Milligan et al. 2024; See **Appendix 3**) by using topography and/or other available methods to negate or reduce auditory and visual intrusions; AND b. locate direct impacts (i.e., surface-disturbing activities) in non-habitat areas first, then in the least suitable habitat for GRSG without creating a barrier to movement or connectivity between GRSG seasonal habitats and populations. C. Third priority—co-locate the project/activity next to or in the footprint of existing infrastructure. **MD SSS 5:** The State Directors[19], in coordination with NDOW, SETT, and/or California Division of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), may grant an exception to the allocation decisions if one of the following applies: i. The proposed activity will be authorized to address federal, state, or local government public health and safety concerns, specifically as they relate to preventing an emergency or responding to a catastrophic event such as a flood, wildfire, or earthquake. ii. The proposed activity is determined to be a routine administrative function conducted by federal, state or local governments, including renewal or reauthorization of prior existing uses, valid existing rights and existing infrastructure (i.e., rights-of-way for roads) or expansion of existing county or local government infrastructure that serves a public purpose and will have no adverse direct/indirect impacts on GRSG and its habitat, or is in compliance with BLM mitigation policy and the State of Nevada's mitigation policy (NAC 232.400-480). iii. Exceptions to non-disposal or exchange of lands that are identified for retention in Appendix A, Figure 2-12 (in the 2019 NV/CA Approved RMP Amendment) could be considered if (a) the lands in question are identified for disposal through previous planning efforts or address a Congressional Acts (e.g., the respective Lincoln and White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Acts) and are in conformance with Nevada State Regulations (e.g., NAC 232.400-480), or (b) the agency can demonstrate that the disposal, including land exchanges, will have no adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts on GRSG and its habitat. **MD SSS 25:** If an Active or Pending Active lek is identified in an area outside of PHMA or GHMA, lek buffer-distances will be applied as described in Appendix B of the 2019 NV/CA Approved RMP Amendment to avoid direct and indirect impacts to lek activity and habitat. Active or Pending Active leks not included in the HMA model will be added when the model is updated.

[19] The California State Office and California State Director administer 1.1 million acres in northwest Nevada and is the Authorized Officer for these BLM lands.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Vegetation
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** N/A **Management Direction:** **MD VEG 28**: Use collaborative planning efforts (e.g., Cooperative Range Improvement Agreement, Local Area Working Groups, Shared Stewardship) to develop and implement habitat restoration and enhancement projects. Projects of this type will use expertise and ideas from entities such as local landowners, local GRSG working groups, permitted land users, and other federal, state, county, and private organizations. Input from interested partners will be solicited by BLM and considered in development of restoration projects.
Fire and Fuels
Objective: Protect post-fire treatments, source areas (e.g., see **Final EIS, Appendix 3**), or areas that are vulnerable to invasive annual grass conversion, including areas essential for connectivity, in PHMA first followed by similar areas in GHMAs, from subsequent wildfires. Incorporate the best available science in the prioritization of post-fire treatments. **Allocation:** N/A **Management Direction:** **MD FIRE 23:** Use prescribed fire designed to reduce wildfire risk or improve GRSG habitat, only when there is no other feasible means to achieve the same or similar result. The NEPA analysis for project implementation will address: • Why alternative techniques were not selected as a viable option; • How GRSG goals and objectives will be met by its use; • How the COT report objectives, as updated, will be addressed and met; and • A risk assessment to address how potential threats to GRSG habitat will be minimized. Prescribed fire shall only be considered after the NEPA analysis for the project has addressed the four bullets outlined above. Prescribed fire can be used to meet specific fuels objectives that will protect GRSG habitat in HMAs. Potential actions can include the creation of fuel breaks, burning slash piles from conifer reduction treatments or burning high-elevation late brood-rearing habitat (e.g., restore senescent vegetation). Management actions can be used in conjunction with other treatment methods to combat annual grasses and restore native plant communities. Avoid prescribed broadcast burns in known GRSG winter habitat. **MD FIRE 25:** Design fuels treatments such as conifer or annual invasive grass removal through an interdisciplinary team process to expand, enhance, maintain, and protect PHMA and GHMA. Fuel reduction techniques, such as mechanical, chemical, and biological (including prescribed and targeted livestock grazing) treatments and prescribed fire (see MD FIRE 23) are acceptable. Use green strips and fuel breaks, where appropriate, to protect treatment areas from subsequent fires. **MD FIRE 43**: Prioritize actions (pre-suppression, suppression, and rehabilitation) that support the persistence of GRSG source areas (see **Appendix 3**). Use the best available science (e.g., Milligan et al. 2024, Doherty et al. 2022, Ricca and Coates 2020, Stringham et al. 2016) to identify habitats essential for maintaining current GRSG populations.

Approved RMP Amendment for PHMA Objective/Allocation/Management Direction
Lands and Realty
Objective: N/A **Allocation:** N/A **Management Direction:** **MD LR 2:** Only utility corridors identified in Appendix A, Figure 2-10 and subsequently approved designated corridors will be managed as designated corridors in PHMAs and GHMAs. All previously designated corridors in PHMAs and GHMAs not shown on the map that were designated through past land use planning efforts have been evaluated and undesignated. **MD LR 17:** Within 4 miles of active and pending leks, require ROW, permit, and lease holders to retrofit those portions of power lines and other utility structures with nesting and perch-deterring devices. Do this during the renewal and amendment process. Monitor and maintain perch-deterring effectiveness through the life of the structures following guidance from scientifically accepted protocols. **MD LR 25:** In PHMA and GHMA, existing or authorized major ROWs and associated maintenance and re-authorizations will be allowed subject to applicable management.

Table 2. General Habitat Management Area (GHMA) Allocations and Management Direction

This table identifies the allocations and management direction and that will be applied in GHMA. The table describes if the Approved RMP Amendment is amending the "objective", "allocation", or "management direction" for the resource topic identified. In some instances, the Approved RMP Amendment addresses all three of these planning categories for a resource topic while in other resource topics only one or two of the categories are amended. All three planning categories are identified for each resource topic and if it is not being amended it will be identified as "N/A", not applicable. In those "N/A" instances, the 2015 or 2019 Amendment decision is not being proposed for amendment and remains in place. The existing 2015 and 2019 Amendment decisions are described in **Appendix 2**.
Maps that show where the allocations and management direction apply can be found in **Appendix 1**, Table and Maps.

Approved RMP Amendment for GHMA Allocations and Management Direction	
Resource Topic	**Allocation and Management Direction**
Utility Scale Solar	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Avoidance for utility scale solar testing and development. Development could be authorized if the Authorized Officer can document that there will be no negative impacts to PHMA or important seasonal habitats in GHMA. **Management Direction:** N/A
Utility Scale Wind	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Avoidance for utility scale wind testing and development, including met towers. Development could be authorized if the Authorized Officer can document that there will be no negative impacts to any PHMA habitats or important seasonal habitats in GHMA. **Management Direction**: N/A
Fluid Minerals (including Geothermal)	**Management Objective, Allocation, and Management Actions**: Same as identified in 2015. Manage oil and gas and geothermal fluid minerals with moderate constraints, timing limitations, and controlled surface use stipulations **Seasonal Constraints/Stipulations** **Seasonal Constraints/Stipulations Exception** The Authorized Officer may consider and provide temporary relief from seasonal constraints by granting an exception after documenting the review of available information associated with the site proposed for the exception. This direction applies in PHMA, GHMA, and all other state identified HMAs. While the BLM considers information from all sources, the State wildlife agency can provide information directly associated with GRSG use, including whether GRSG populations are not using the seasonal habitat during that year's seasonal life cycle period. Based on this information and recommendation, and documented variability in precipitation (e.g., early/late spring, long/heavy winter), use patterns, or other applicable information the Authorized Officer may consider a one-time exception if development associated with it will not affect GRSG habitat use. **Seasonal Constraints/Stipulations Modifications** The BLM may grant modifications on a case-by-case basis to seasonal restrictions if the BLM, in coordination with the state wildlife agency and other appropriate state authorities determines that granting the modification will not adversely impact the population being protected. The Authorized Officer may consider and grant a modification to the dates and areas associated with seasonal timing restrictions after documenting the modification is warranted and consistent with the criteria described below. Seasonal modification is warranted if the geographic and temporal conditions demonstrate that the seasonal modification will better protect or enhance GRSG and its habitat than implementing the strict application of seasonal timing restrictions. Under this scenario modifications can occur if one or more of the following conditions can be documented:

Approved RMP Amendment for GHMA Allocations and Management Direction	
Resource Topic	**Allocation and Management Direction**
Fluid Minerals (including Geothermal) ***(continued)***	• A proposed authorization is expected to have beneficial or neutral impacts on GRSG and its habitat. • Topography or other factors eliminate direct and indirect visible and audible impacts to GRSG and its habitat. • There are documented local variations that indicate the seasonal life cycle periods are different than presented. • Modifications are needed to address an immediate public health and safety concern in a timely manner (e.g., maintaining a road impacted by flooding). **Seasonal Constraints/Stipulations Waiver** The Authorized Officer may consider and grant a waiver of the stipulation on an existing lease if the area that was mapped as a GRSG habitat management area, regardless of type, when the lease was issued is no longer mapped as such through the appropriate planning process.
Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Open. **Management Direction:** Apply state-specific minimization measures identified in the existing RMP Amendments (refer to **Appendix 2**).
Nonenergy Leasable Minerals	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Open. **Management Direction:** Apply state-specific minimization measures identified in the existing RMP Amendments (refer to **Appendix 2**)
Locatable Minerals	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Open, unless currently withdrawn. **Management Direction:** N/A
Major Rights of Way	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Open with applicable state minimization measures from 2015 and 2019 RMP Amendments to maintain habitat supporting GRSG populations consistent with state agency habitat designations (e.g., restoration, connectivity, seasonal, or other), and to preclude negative impacts to PHMA habitats. **Management Direction:** N/A
Minor Rights-of-Way	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Open with applicable requirements from 2015 RMP Amendment (refer to **Appendix 2**). **Management Direction:** N/A
Livestock Grazing	Same as PHMA except RM-2 does not apply.
Wild Horse and Burro	Same as PHMA.
Mitigation	Same as PHMA
Predation	Same as PHMA

Approved RMP Amendment for GHMA Allocations and Management Direction	
Resource Topic	**Allocation and Management Direction**
Disturbance Cap	No GHMA disturbance cap management direction.
Adaptive Management	Same as PHMA
Lek Definitions	Same as PHMA
Criteria Based Management Direction for Non-Habitat	Same as PHMA
Special Status Species	Same as PHMA
Vegetation	Same as PHMA
Fire and Fuels	Same as PHMA
Lands and Realty	Same as PHMA

Table 3. Other Habitat Management Area (OHMA) Allocations and Management Direction

This table identifies the allocations and management direction and that will be applied in the Other HMA (OHMA).
Maps that show where the allocations and management direction apply can be found in **Appendix 1**, Table and Maps.

Approved RMP Amendment for OHMA Allocations and Management Direction	
Resource Topic	**Allocations and Management Direction**
Utility Scale Solar	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Open for utility scale solar testing and development with applicable minimization measures and compensatory mitigation to maintain habitat supporting GRSG populations and to preclude negative impacts to adjacent GHMA and PHMA habitats. **Management Direction:** N/A
Utility Scale Wind	**Objective:** N/A **Allocation:** Open for utility scale wind testing and development with applicable minimization measures and compensatory mitigation to maintain habitat supporting GRSG populations and to preclude negative impacts to adjacent GHMA and PHMA habitats. **Management Direction:** N/A

Appendices

APPENDIX 1 – TABLE AND MAPS

APPENDIX 2 – COMPARISON OF PRIOR GREATER SAGE-GROUSE RMP MANAGEMENT DIRECTION WITH APPROVED RMP AMENDMENT

APPENDIX 3 – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE MONITORING FRAMEWORK

APPENDIX 4 – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE HABITAT INDICATORS AND BENCHMARKS

APPENDIX 5 – LIVESTOCK GRAZING BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND DESIGN FEATURES AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

APPENDIX 6 – GLOSSARY

APPENDIX 7 – REFERENCES

APPENDIX 8 – U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE SECTION 7 CONCURRENCE MEMO

APPENDIX 9 – BLM ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES BETWEEN PROPOSED RMPA AND ROD

This page intentionally left blank.